THE STANDARD

NO. 78—VOL. III, NO. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1888. PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE STANDARD FOR THE CAMPAIGN.

Subscriptions to THE STANDARD from now to the close of the campaign will be received at the following rates:

Single subscription	80c
Ten or more, each	70c
One hundred or more, each . . .	65c

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid to have the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

CONTENTS.

The republican national convention, in all respects a marked contrast to the democratic convention, concluded its week of travail by the nomination of Benjamin Harrison of Indiana for president and Levi P. Morton of New York for vice-president.

Despite all the philosophy he can muster, Mr. Blaine must be a bitterly disappointed man. He has come as close to such a republican nomination as he could have accepted as he did four years ago to election, and has for the second time been beaten by his friends. The most popular man in the ranks of his party, and the leading representative of all that it will stand for in this campaign, it would have been in the fitness of things that he should again this year have been pitted against the man with whom he contended for the presidency four years ago. But he could not with prudence have struggled for the nomination. To be beaten in such a struggle would have been ignominy, while to succeed would have aroused animosities that would have increased the chances of defeat before the people. The only way he could with prudence again have entered the presidential contest would have been as the unsolicited choice of a convention unable to agree upon any one else. That he was the choice of a strong majority of the convention is clear. From first ballot to last there was not a moment when he could not have been nominated with a rush, and the votes of the majority who were eager to vote for him would have been swelled by the votes which always hasten to the side of the successful. If his name had been kept out of the list while his friends had at least seemed to be searching for some other candidate on whom a union could be made—if ballot after ballot had been vainly pushed until at last he had been brought in as the only man that could satisfy the convention, there can be no doubt that his nomination might have been made in a way that he could gladly have accepted. But the over shrewdness of his managers, or the bull-headed enthusiasm of some of his followers, finally got him into a position in which a nomination, though it might readily have been forced, would have had a worse flavor of effort and intrigue than if he had been all along an avowed contestant; and both dignity and prudence compelled him to absolutely decline.

The candidate who by favor of Mr. Blaine and his friends has received the nomination of the convention does not arouse the opposition that in some quarters would have been aroused by Blaine. But neither can he awaken the strength. Negative availability is not what, in this juncture, the broken republican party needs. And as the St. Louis convention closed with the premonition and confidence of victory, so does the Chicago convention close with the foreshadowings of defeat.

Blaine's nomination would have aroused a flash of enthusiasm bright and fierce, though it might have proved thin. But though General Harrison is the Blaine alternate and is closely connected with the most important of Mr. Blaine's lieutenants, being, it is said, a partner of Mr. Stephen Elkins in his great New Mexico land grab, his nomination falls with a thud. General Harrison has a much cleaner record than Mr. Blaine, but he has not had the seasoning of abuse. All sorts of unpopular things are being discovered about him, and he may possibly even find that it is an incumbrance to be the first candidate to have had ancestors.

But for all this the issue is clearly made. General Harrison represents all that Mr. Blaine could have represented, even if not so aggressively, while the banker, Levi P. Morton, makes a fine contrast to the greenbacker, Thurman. As for the platform, that leaves nothing to be desired. By denouncing all reduction of duties and declaring for still higher protection it formally draws the line between the great parties upon the principle of protection as opposed to the principle of free trade. In its way the Chicago convention has served the country well. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad."

Among the most prominent figures in the convention was Creed Haymond, chairman of the California delegation, and foremost among the "boomers" of "Blaine and Protection." To those who knew him years ago it seemed a queer place for him to be. Creed Haymond is a Virginian by birth, and a democrat by instinct and tradition. During the war in California he was a strong secessionist and afterward was prominent and useful as an anti-monopoly, free trade democrat. He is a fine lawyer, a man of exceedingly quick and nimble mind, and, like most southern men of his class, a born politician. He rendered very efficient aid to Governor Haight in his struggle with the Pacific railway monopoly, and no one in the country could have better startled the Chicago convention with a Jeffersonian speech. But like many other men in California, Creed Haymond at length grew tired of what seemed an utterly hopeless fight, and the railroad octopus, true to its policy of taking into its service men of ability who might be dangerous to it outside, made him head of its law bureau with a salary of $25,000 a year. Thus it comes that Creed Haymond makes his appearance in a national republican convention at the head of a delegation representing the Central Pacific railroad ring.

Two preposterous candidates were presented at Chicago and got some votes—Judge Gresham of Illinois and Chauncey M. Depew of New York. Judge Gresham was a preposterous candidate because in a convention where corporation influences were so powerful it was utterly impossible that a man with a record objectionable to them could be nominated. Mr. Depew was a preposterous candidate because to nominate him would have been to give up every western state. The masses would have taken it as a nomination of the New York Central to the presidency. And they are not quite ready for that. This may seem hard to the genial New York railroad man, and is perhaps unreasonable, for it is not improbable that a railroad magnate might be more careful of the people's interests if placed in a position of public responsibility than a railroad magnates' man. But it is a natural result of the manner in which the railroad companies, especially in the west, have exerted their power—a natural result of the antagonism that must exist until the railroads openly own the government or the government owns the railroads.

Ex-Mayor Seth Low of Brooklyn, a foremost representative of what is really the best element of the republican party, has formally withdrawn now that that party has taken logical protectionist ground, and declared for reducing the surplus by raising the tariff taxes. Mr. Low does not propose to join the democratic party at once, but, like many thousands of independent citizens, he will support Mr. Cleveland. The attitude of the Chicago *Tribune*, the great republican paper of the northwest, is also very significant. It has not declared for Cleveland; but it has evidently started in to beat Harrison. The attitude of the New York *Herald* is also strongly indicative of the way the wind is blowing. Cleveland's election seems now as certain as his nomination was four months before it took place. But it can be made, and it ought to be made, such a sweeping and decisive victory as will forever settle rampant protectionism in the United States.

General Weaver has been renominated for congress in the Sixth district of Iowa by the union labor convention. He will doubtless be also renominated by the democrats, as he ought to be. In the great question which for the present dwarfs all others in national politics he has stood by the policy of President Cleveland and has supported the Mills bill as sturdily as Mills himself. The democrats will need the greenback congressman. The time is near at hand when the currency question will again come to the front, and the democracy, just as it has been forced to take sides for the rights of the people on the tariff question, will be forced to take sides for the rights of the people on the financial question.

Congressman Henry Smith, the labor representative of Milwaukee, is another man whom the radical division that has taken place in our politics has brought to the democratic side. He not only stands for the Mills bill, but proclaims his readiness to go much further in reducing and abolishing duties. In an interview with the Washington correspondent of the Binghamton *Leader*, Congressman Smith says:

It is not true that a reduction of the tariff will reduce the wages of either skilled or unskilled labor. The cry that wages will be reduced is started by combinations of capital for their own selfish purposes, and this is so evident that I am surprised men should not clearly see the fact. I am here because laboring men in my district thought I would fairly represent them and would care for their interests. I have worked in the shop, and when I am told that in supporting a reduction of tariff taxes upon the people I am voting to reduce wages, I say I know better. I know that there are millions of men in this country under the present system who do not get six months' steady employment out of the year. I know that trusts and combinations formed to restrict production and compel high prices, shut down their shops and throw men out of employment, and that the tariff as it exists is the cause. I have never had any doubt on this subject, and the investigation of trusts by the committee on manufactures, of which I am a member, has fortified my conviction. Page after page of the testimony we have obtained shows that the tariff is an incentive to the formation of these trusts and combinations of capital, and has been so used for years. The combination of tariff "protection," as they call it, and railroad monopoly leads to trusts. The tariff and railroad monopoly may be "wholesome" for trusts, but by them labor is "shelved" every time.

I take up the gauntlet thrown down by Congressman W. D. Kelley and declare that a Chinese wall around this country is unnatural. That nation grows richest, happiest, and most prosperous which has intercourse with its neighbors. In the Bible you will find it said that Israel was most prosperous under King Solomon, and then "it traded with all the nations." My experience with workingmen is that we have no such hatred against our fellow laborers in other countries as is now sought to be created and stirred up. We commiserate the condition of workingmen in other lands and attribute it to class legislation for the benefit of the rich and against the poor. We see the same tendency in this country, not only in the high tariff, but in railroad monopoly and other matters I have spoken of, and we should be the first and most active in preventing such legislation hereafter and removing it when it exists. The success of the trusts in defeating a reduction of taxes now would probably lead them to make still further demands for legislation for their benefit against the country's good.

Samuel T. Hopkins of the Sixth Virginia district is another of the "labor representatives" in congress who has taken radical ground in favor of the Mills bill, and who derides the notion that protection helps labor. These men, and not the Forans, represent the real feelings of American workingmen. The tenor of the labor press all over the country shows conclusively that the "pauper labor" bugaboo has lost its power. A great process of education has been going on in the ranks of labor for some years past, and workingmen have largely learned that their real foe is monopoly. What they think of the tariff monopolies is going to be made apparent this year. What they think of some other monopolies will appear later, as the great anti-monopoly movement of which this attack upon "protection" is the beginning, reaches later stages of development.

I went over to Williamsburgh last Friday evening, at the invitation of Mr. O. F. Burton, representing the Protective tariff league, to debate the question of free trade vs. protection with Mr. John Jarrett of Pittsburg. I have some doubts as to how the members of the Protective tariff league enjoyed it, but to me the meeting was one of the most significant and gratifying I have ever taken part in. The night was so oppressively hot that it hardly seemed possible that twenty people could be found to sit under gaslight in a close hall and listen to a tariff debate. But, to my astonishment, the hall filled up as soon as the meeting began; and in spite of the heat the large audience remained sitting or standing until the close. With perhaps two or three exceptions, it was an audience composed entirely of workingmen, and an audience that not only by its presence on such a night, but by its applause, its ejaculations, its questions and its comments, showed an intense and most intelligent interest in the subject. Nothing could be more significant of how the discussion of the tariff question is going on among the very men that the protectionists most rely upon, and how it is coming down to bottom principles. There were evidently among the audience not merely any number of men ready to argue for absolute free trade on general principles, but many who had made themselves thoroughly conversant with the effect of the tariff on their particular trades. Even the questions and comments of the protectionists among the audience showed that the "old chestnuts" of protectionism are beginning to lose their power. As for the debate, I, having won the opening by the right turn of a half dollar belonging to Mr. Jarrett, put him on the defensive at the start and the audience kept him there. When I left the hall he was surrounded by a crowd of men in their shirt sleeves plying him with hard questions.

I got at this meeting not merely a most gratifying indication of the great work our agitation of the single tax has been doing in starting men to think, but also some evidence of the good the *Press* is doing. The *Press*, the one cent protectionist daily, edited by Robert P. Porter, is unquestionably the brightest, ablest and most afraidless of all the protectionist papers in the United States, and is rapidly running up a large circulation in New York and vicinity for its daily issue, and a large circulation through the country for its weekly—the Tariff league sending it one paid subscriber for every one it gets for itself. It, too, is evidently setting men to thinking. From the references I heard made to it at this meeting it must have a big circulation in the eastern district of Brooklyn. Possibly this may account for what one protectionist said to another on leaving the hall: "There were too many free traders in that meeting!"

At this meeting also there was brought out an interesting fact about the editor of the *Press* and how he caught protectionism. It seems that Thomas G. Shearman, who took the side of free trade at a previous meeting of the same kind held by the Protective tariff league in another part of Brooklyn, paid to Mr. Porter's intellect the compliment of saying that he could not believe in his own arguments for protection. Mr. O. F. Burton, who presided at Friday's meeting with great dignity and fairness, referred to this in his opening speech, saying that Mr. Porter felt hurt at such an intimation. Mr. Porter, Mr. Burton continued, had always been a protectionist. He was born in Norfolk, England, and was the son of a rich farmer, who had been ruined by the abolition of the corn laws, and from this Mr. Porter, when a boy, had imbibed an honest hatred of free trade. Here we have it! Mr. Robert P. Porter, the popular champion in America of what he calls the "American system of protection," is simply an hereditary English tory, who, in American protection recognizes the old tory system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few that we borrowed from England!

Mr. Burton and the gentlemen of the Protective tariff league do, it is evident, really believe in protection, and have the courage of their convictions, as their getting up of these debates shows. Mr. Burton promises that they shall be resumed in September. It is to be hoped that this public discussion will not be confined to Brooklyn, but will extend throughout the whole country.

The *Herald* has been exposing the frightfully overcrowded condition of the Italian quarters of New York. But neither in the *Herald*, nor in any other of our daily papers, does the shameful condition of these poor Italians seem to rouse any other thought than that of forcibly clearing the Italian quarters and checking immigration. Thirty-four thousand four hundred and thirty-nine Italians have been landed in this port during the first five and a half months of this year. Says the *Herald:*

They are pouring in at the rate of eighty thousand this year. For what?

To choke up the city and be a curse to it.

There is no work for these men. They are duped and buncoed by a hundred or more New York so-called Italian bankers, whose agents in Calabria paint glowing pictures of the golden field that invites their labor.

It is swindling of the most heartless sort.

It drags the immigrant into poverty, misery and disease. It creates plague spots in New York. It threatens native labor.

But is there *not* here a golden field that invites their labor—a golden field of unused land that affords opportunities for the labor, not of thousands, but of millions?

Why is there no work for these men? Why are they compelled to choke up the city and be a curse to it, to create plague spots and threaten native labor? Are there no vacant lots in New York city; no unused land around it? Has this great continent grown so that it is overcrowded with our sixty million people? Will the *Herald* consider these questions?

I have frequently heard it said that when a man gets past forty his opinions are fixed, and that there is no use in trying to change them. My experience has been the reverse of this, and many of the best friends that our cause has found have been in men, like the late Francis G. Shaw, who were long past forty. Here is an extract from a letter of R. M. Maxwell of Harlan, Iowa, which suggests this:

I am nearly sixty-six years of age; commenced my political career as an abolitionist, and was then a republican. Within the last two years I have changed my opinion with regard to "private property in land" and "protection to our infant industries," and am now advocating the "George theories" with all my might. I am a regular subscriber to THE STANDARD, and am using all the little influence I have to extend its circulation in this part of the country; also your books on the land question, single tax and free trade. I have been the means of putting about twenty copies of "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade" into the hands of men who when they will have read them thoroughly will "see the cat."

Mr. Maxwell has also been doing good work in writing single tax articles for the local papers.

In the last issue of THE STANARD DI reviewed Governor Hill's avowed reasons for vetoing the electoral reform bill. In this issue we print a more elaborate and closely critical review of them by an able lawyer, Mr. Louis F. Post—a review made at the request of the governor himself. Governor Hill is well aware of the confidence which Mr. Post enjoys among those who, as by the resolutions of the Central labor union, have so clearly shown their indignation at this veto, and doubtless fully appreciates the value of any indorsement, however slight, which Mr. Post could give to the reasons for vetoing the bill set forth in his memorandum. But, as will be seen, Mr. Post has been unable to find in these reasons any ground for the veto. His careful examination, on the contrary, shows that Governor Hill's position is utterly untenable, and that the bill, so far from being in any respect unconstitutional, is in conformity both with the spirit and the letter of the fundamental law, and would give greater security to those rights of the voter which that instrument guarantees. I commend this letter to the careful study of every reader of THE STANDARD.

Governor Hill is still talked of for the democratic nomination. If he gets it, the state campaign ought to turn upon this great reform. To secure it from the next legislature Governor Hill must be beaten.

HENRY GEORGE.

The Late Colonel King-Harman.

London Star.

Death has moved one of the government's difficulties out of its way. The impossible, the outrageous appointment of Colonel King-Harman to be under-secretary for Ireland, has been annulled. The colonel has died in the fifty-first year of his age, after vainly seeking the health he had lost in change of scene and climate. Physically, if not morally or intellectually, the colonel was one of the finest of his time. Standing over six feet in his stockings, broadly and squarely built, and with features which only wanted a touch of refinement to please the most exacting taste for beauty, the late master of Rockingham looked like a figure cut clean from one of Lever's novels. His mind and temper were like his person. He had a stormy youth, and the delight of battle—of the scrimmage in Cremorne, of the election row, of the faction fight—was, in his earlier days, strong on him. Such a man could not well lack personal charm, and with the curious fidelity of their race, his Irish tenants were deeply attached to him. For years he was their darling. But the depression in agriculture exposed the merciless system of rack renting on which Colonel King-Harman's splendor was built, and from that time forward the old relations changed. In the struggle that followed the landlord stood stiffly on his rights. Perhaps it is charitable to assume that for the worst acts of tyranny on the estate the agent and not the owner was responsible; but no friend of Ireland can forget that dark chapter in the story of Irish suffering. That Colonel King-Harman did not escape unscathed is well known. At one time he enjoyed a princely rent roll of £40,000 a year. His demesne at Rockingham, near Boyle, was an example of feudal state and grandeur. His park extended over 5,000 acres. But the wild life of earlier days—the extravagance, the caprices, the recklessness of the man of thirty—had reduced the landlord prince almost as low as some of his unhappy dependents. A great domestic grief almost broke his heart, and added to his financial difficulties. His son—the light of his eyes, a generous, frank boy, and physically a small model of himself—died after a short career in the army. His father had already arranged with him to cut off the entail of the estates, and thus relieve the property of its worst embarrassments. Fate, indeed, was hard to him all through.

He was born for the army, and in an evil hour turned politician. As every one knows, he made his debut as a home ruler, a follower of Isaac Butt. Mr. Egan wrote his first election address for him, and was his close political associate. His right-about-face is well known. His difficulties with his tenants turned the out-and-out nationalist into a rabid orangeman, and of late years no man among the orange ranks has more openly advocated rebellion against the government which dared to give Ireland home rule. The fall was great; but personally Colonel King-Harman had few enemies. He was an excellent story teller, a good companion at mess or dinner table. His ruined fortunes, his hardness with his tenants, made him a kind of object lesson in Irish landlordism; but there were some redeeming features in his character. He died a disappointed, an embittered, practically a hopeless man, when he might have been an honored and successful one.

Wobbles a Little, but Strikes the Truth at Last.

Evening Post Editorial.

It may be assumed that the American people are in favor of sufficient protection to counterbalance the higher wages paid in manufacturing employments here as compared with like industries abroad, but not sufficient to create monopolies, trusts and "combines." . . We think that Mr. Cleveland and the democratic party will gain votes continuously as the campaign proceeds and the truth is made clear to the people that taxes, however laid, are burdens on industry, and that the country cannot get rich by increasing and multiplying such burdens.

Bravo! Don't Let Them Bring Their Protectionist Barbarism to this Country.

New York Press.

Benjamin Harrison is opposed to the immigration of Chinese laborers. He would have them stay in the land which has suffered them to so degenerate.

ELECTION REFORM.

GOV. HILL'S REASONS FOR VETOING THE AUSTRALIAN BALLOT BILL.

They are Examined by Louis F. Post at the Governor's Request.

David B. Hill, Governor of New York:

I am in receipt of your letter of June 16, inclosing a copy of your veto of the electoral bill and asking me to examine it carefully and see whether in my judgment the grounds, or at least many of them, are not entirely sound. I have made the examination, the results of which I now respectfully submit.

The bill is an adaptation of what is commonly known as the Australian system of voting. Its substantial requirements are as follows: Ballots are to be provided at public expense; none but these ballots are to be used; on them are to be printed the names of all candidates who are nominated either by conventions or petitions a short period prior to the election; the ballots are to be distributed only by sworn ballot clerks, at the polls, to voters, and for actual and immediate use in voting; the voter is allowed five minutes in which to retire into a booth conveniently arranged, where he secretly marks his choice of candidates upon the face of the ballot, or, if he prefers, writes the names of candidates of his own nomination in place of those whose names are already printed; having done this he proceeds directly to the ballot box, and, without exposing the face of the ballot or communicating with any one, deposits the ballot as his vote. For the benefit of the blind and illiterate, such a voter is permitted to select one of the two ballot clerks, who under oath of fidelity and secrecy assists him to mark his ballot.

Your principal objections to the bill relate to the question of its constitutionality, and are (1) that it embarrasses, hinders and impedes electors in exercising their constitutional right of suffrage; and (2) that as to a class of voters, the blind and illiterate, it destroys the secrecy of the ballot by compelling an avowal of their votes as a condition of exercising the right.

I consider these objections in their order.

Is the bill unconstitutional on the ground that it embarrasses, hinders or impedes electors in exercising the right of suffrage?

It is indisputably true, as you claim, that "the legislature cannot exact any qualification for the exercise of the electoral franchise other than as prescribed by the constitution." The qualifications prescribed by the constitution are set out in section 1 of article II, as follows:

Every male citizen of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been a citizen for ten days and an inhabitant of this state one year next preceding an election, and for the last four months a resident of the county, and for the last thirty days a resident of the election district in which he may offer his vote, shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district of which he shall at the time be a resident, and not elsewhere, for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elective by the people, and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people.

This provision of the constitution is not self executing, the manner of conducting elections being left to legislative regulation. The only express limitation of this legislative power is that the election shall be by ballot (art. II, sec. 5), which I will consider in examining your objections to the features of the bill that relate to blind and illiterate voters; and the only implied limitation is that such regulations as the legislature may prescribe shall be reasonable.

Your view that under the constitutional provision quoted above a statute is void if it "embarrasses, hinders or impedes an elector" in the exercise of his right of suffrage, is correct; but as a statute which puts the voter to inconvenience does not in any legal sense "embarrass, hinder or impede" him in the exercise of his right, unless the inconvenience be such as to subvert or injuriously restrain the right, it is important to be cautious lest inconvenient but useful regulations be erroneously regarded as invasions of the constitutional guarantee.

One of the earliest cases illustrating the principle that constitutional guarantees of the right of suffrage do not prohibit reasonable modes of exercising the right, is Temple vs. Mead (4 Verm., 540). The constitution of Vermont required a "written" ballot; the plaintiff offered one that was printed, and the ballot being refused, brought an action against the election officers. It was argued that a ballot not written with pen and ink was void, but the court held otherwise. Williams, J., who wrote the opinion, used language especially worthy of consideration in connection with the subject of your veto: "In construing the clause of the constitution now under consideration," he said, "we ought not so to consider it as to lay the freemen under any *unnecessary* restraint or embarrassment in the expression of their opinion as to the most suitable person to fill the several public offices for which they may vote. We ought not to believe that it was intended that voting for these officers should always continue in the same particular manner, or that the votes should be of the same materials, or in the same way which was then in use, without any regard to the changes which might take place or the improvements which might be made." See also Henshaw vs. Foster (9 Pick., 312).

With reference to the secrecy of the ballot sought to be secured by the electoral bill, and also to the origin of the ballot and a relation historically between its origin and the mode of using it proposed by the electoral bill, the following excerpt from Judge Williams's opinion is at least interesting:

The principal object of this last mode [voting by ballot] is to enable the elector to exp

press his opinion secretly, without being subject to be overawed, or to any ill will or persecution on account of his vote for either of the candidates who may be before the public. The method of voting by tablets in Rome was an example of this manner of voting. There certain officers appointed for that purpose called diribitores [which might be freely translated "ballot clerks"], delivered to every voter as many tablets as there were candidates, one of whose names was written upon every tablet. The voter put into a chest prepared for that purpose which of these tablets he pleased, and they were afterward taken out and counted. Cicero defines tablets to be little *billets* in which the people brought their suffrages.

An extreme case illustrating the principle that the legislature may regulate the manner of exercising constitutional rights of suffrage is Davis vs. School District (44 N. H., 398), which holds that a statute requiring six months' residence in a town prior to election is a reasonable regulation of the exercise of the right of suffrage vested by the constitution in "all dwellers in the town;" and many cases as well as opinions of text writers might be quoted to show that the manner of exercising any right whatever which the constitution confers by provisions not self executing, is subject to and dependent on reasonable legislative regulation. (Cooley's Const. Lim., marg. p. 83.)

But it is by registration laws that legislatures have most frequently undertaken to regulate the exercise of the right of suffrage, and approached nearest to the line that separates a reasonable regulation from a substantial invasion of the right. To cases growing out of such laws, therefore, we may hopefully turn for light upon the first constitutional question raised by your veto. The issue in this class of cases relates to the power of the legislature, in the absence of express constitutional authority, to require the voter to register before the election as a condition of voting at the election.

The eight cases cited by you to the point that statutes requiring registration before election so embarrass, hinder or impede the exercise of the right of suffrage as to amount to a denial of the right itself, arose, two in Wisconsin, two in Ohio, one in Pennsylvania, one in Iowa, one in Oregon and one in Nebraska. The Pennsylvania case (Page vs. Allen, 58 Pa. st., 338) and one of the Ohio cases (Monroe vs. Collins, 17 Ohio st., 666) are not in point; the Iowa case (Edmunds vs. Barry, 28 Iowa, 267) sustains a registration law which does not make prior registration obligatory; one of the Wisconsin cases (Wood vs. Baker, 38 Wis., 71) is like the Iowa case, except that the opinion contains a dictum to the effect that a law which made prior registration obligatory would be void; the other Wisconsin case (Dells vs. Kennedy, 49 Wis., 555) is based on this dictum and the irrelevant Pennsylvania decision, and was determined by a divided court; and the Oregon case (White vs. County, 10 Pacific Reporter, 484) was decided by a divided court. There remain, therefore, but two of the eight decisions—one in Ohio (Daggett vs. Hudson, 43 Ohio st., 548) and the other in Nebraska (State vs. Conner, 24 Reporter, 723)—which are positive authorities against the power of the legislature to require registration prior to an election.

Against this view is the leading case on the subject, Capen vs. Foster (12 Pick., 485), which was decided by the supreme court of Massachusetts in 1832, Chief Justice Shaw writing the opinion. A statute required that no person should vote at an election whose name was not previously placed on the list of voters. The constitution prescribed that every citizen having certain qualifications should have the right to vote, but did not require his name to be listed; and the question was whether the statute was inconsistent with the constitution. Persons whose names were omitted were allowed by the statute to apply to be listed on the day of election; but as they were required to apply *before* the opening of the polls, and if not listed when the polls opened could not vote, there is no distinction in principle between that statute and one that should require registration before election day, for if the legislature has the right to fix a time at all it has the right to fix any reasonable time. The court decided that this law was constitutional, holding it to prescribe a reasonable regulation of the mode of voting, and not, as was contended, an additional qualification of the voter. Chief Justice Shaw laid down the general rule as follows (p. 489):

In all cases where the constitution has conferred a political right or privilege, and where the constitution has not particularly designated the manner in which that right is to be exercised, it is clearly within the just and constitutional limits of the legislative power to adopt any reasonable and uniform regulations in regard to the time and mode of exercising that right, which are designed to secure and facilitate the exercise of such right, in a prompt, orderly and convenient manner.

Again, he said (p. 492):

The constitution, by carefully prescribing the qualifications of voters, necessarily requires that an examination of the claims of persons to vote, on the ground of possessing these qualifications, must at some time be had by those who are to decide on them. . . . If then the constitution has made no provision in regard to the time, place and manner in which such examination shall be had, and yet such an examination is necessarily incident to the actual enjoyment and exercise of the right of voting, it constitutes one of those subjects respecting the mode of exercising the right, in relation to which it is competent to the legislature to make suitable and reasonable regulations, not calculated to defeat or impair the right of voting, but rather to facilitate and secure the exercise of that right.

In the course of his opinion Chief Justice Shaw threw further light on the legislative power of regulating elections (p. 490) by referring to an old statute which prohibited the reception of any vote unless delivered in writing by the voter in person. The constitution was silent upon the question whether votes for certain officials should be given personally or by proxy, viva voce or by ballot, and it was as well open to insistance then that a voter could claim the right of voting viva voce or by proxy as it is now that he may claim the right to vote without previously registering or without the formalities required by the electoral bill. But of the law requiring a vote in writing by the voter in person, Judge Shaw said:

We think it cannot be doubted that this is a just exercise of legislative power, providing an easy and reasonable mode of exercising the constitutional right, and one calculated to prevent error and fraud, to secure order and regularity in the conduct of elections, and thereby give more security to the right itself.

On the question of compulsory registration prior to election, the United States district judge of the northern district of Georgia said of a statute which closed the registry ten days before election (Weil vs. Calhoun, 25 Fed. Rep., 871):

If the period between the registration and election be brief, and only such as is proper for making out and putting in proper shape the registration papers, it seems to me that both reason and authority sanction such registration laws. The authorities are in conflict, but in my judgment sound sense and a due regard to the true interest of the state should lead a court to sustain such laws as strike but a prelude and preparation for the election and a part of its machinery, even though some days intervene between the close of the registration and the actual opening of the polls. It is self-evident that some time must be taken for making out the returns of the registration and putting them in shape for use at the polls; and whether this shall be one hour, or one, two or ten days, would seem to depend on the legislative will, and if not grossly excessive ought to be sustained.

The proposition of the two authoritative cases cited by you that a registration law is good if it saves the right to vote by allowing the voter to prove his right on election day, provided he then gives proper reason for not having registered, is completely disposed of by Judge Taylor in his able dissenting opinion in Dills vs. Kennedy (49 Wis., 555). He said:

If the legislature has any power to require a registration of the electors to be made previous to the day of election and to compel the non-registered elector to give some good reason for his failing to procure himself to be registered before he shall be allowed to vote on the day of election, it has the same power to enforce the registration by depriving the elector of the right to vote unless he becomes registered as required by law. If the legislature may compel the elector to give a reason for not registering, it may delare what shall be a sufficient reason, and permit only such excuse for not registering as in its discretion it may deem a valid excuse.

And the kindred notion that the right to vote must be contiuued down to the day of voting is thus met by Judge Thayer in his dissenting opinion in White vs. County (10 Pacific Reporter, 491):

The claim that the right to register should be continued down to the day of voting in order to make the regulation reasonable would destroy the whole efficiency of it. There is an object and purpose in such a law. It is intended to prevent illegal voting. This cannot be accomplished unless the names of the voters are enrolled a length of time before the election, so that they can be inspected and it be ascertained whether they have the requisite qualifications or not. If it is left until the day of election when they can rush in 'pell-mell' and roll under their tongue as a 'sweet morsel' a false oath regarding their qualifications as an elector, it would be an idle, useless performance, and the community would be as well off without it.

In his work on Constitutional Limitations (marg., p. 601), Judge Cooley writes:

Where the constitution has established no such rule [registration in advance of elections], and is entirely silent on the subject, it has sometimes been claimed that the statute requiring voters to be registered before the day of election, and excluding from the right all those whose names do not appear upon the list, was unconstitutional and void, as adding another test to the qualifications of electors which the constitution has prescribed, and as having the effect where electors are not registered to exclude from voting persons who have an absolute right to that franchise by the fundamental law. The position, however, has not been generally accepted as sound by the courts. The provision for a registry deprives no one of his right, but is only a reasonable regulation under which the right may be exercised. Such regulations must always have been within the power of the legislature, unless forbidden. Many resting upon the same principle are always prescribed and have never been supposed to be open to objection.

That the weight of authority is with Judge Cooley was in terms declared by the supreme court of Kansas in sustaining a law requiring registration ten days prior to election as a condition of voting at the election. (State vs. Butts, 31 Kan., 557, 553.) And Judge McCrary in the latest edition of his treatise on the law of elections takes the same view when he writes (sec. 95):

Is an act which denies the right to vote to all persons not registered on or before a fixed day prior to the day of election, and which makes no provision for registration after the time limited, so onerous and unreasonable as to be justly regarded as an impairment of the constitutional right to vote? According to the great weight of authority and of reason also, this question must be answered in the negative.

Besides the cases I have already cited, the following may be referred to: People vs. Kopplekom, 16 Mich., 342; Byler vs. Asher, 47 Ill., 101; Ensworth vs. Albin, 46 Mo., 405; People vs. Hoffman, 116 Ill., 587; McMahon vs. Mayor, 66 Ga., 217; Patterson vs. Barlow, 60 Pa. st., 54; In re Polling Lists, 13 R. I., 729.

Some of these decisions holding that laws requiring registration prior to elections are valid having been made in states where registry laws are permitted by the constitution, it has been argued that they are not in point. Inasmuch, however, as none of the constitutions empower the legislature to make suffrage conditional upon prior registration, Judge McCrary is of opinion that they are as directly in point as if there had been no constitutional provision for registration laws. (McCrary on elections, sec. 97.) In our own state the only express constitutional authority for a registry law is the provision (art. II, sec. 4) that laws shall be made for ascertaining by proper proofs the citizens who shall be entitled to the right of suffrage. This does not authorize disfranchisement for failure to register before the day of election, except by implication, and the authority may be implied as well from the section which prescribes a voter's qualifications as from that which authorizes laws for ascertaining the qualifications. The power to make registration laws "exists in either case and in either case the question must be the same, viz.: whether the act when passed merely regulates the exercise of the right to vote, or goes further and impairs it." (McCrary, sec. 97.) Yet we have long had a registry law in this state which disfranchises all who do not register ten days before election, and its constitutionality has not been questioned.

I think the conclusion is irresistible that registry laws which fix a time for registry prior to the day of election, and disfranchise the non-registered voter, are not additional qualifications of the suffrage, but regulations of its exercise, and if the interval between the time fixed and the election be not excessive, reasonable regulations. Such laws, though they put the voter to inconvenience and may in instances deprive him of his vote without any fault of his own, do not in the legal sense embarrass, hinder or impede his exercise of the right; and being calculated to protect it by preventing frauds, are within the constitutional power of the legislature.

Now, in view of the elementary principle that a constitutional right unaccompanied by constitutional rules for its exercise, is subject to and dependent on legislative regulation, and remembering, by way of illustration, that laws requiring previous registration as a condition of exercising the right of suffrage are appropriate regulations, what possible objection to the electoral bill can be referred to that clause of the constitution which prescribes the qualifications of electors?

The providing of ballots at public expense is a positive convenience to both voter and candidate; forbidding the use of ballots privately printed prevents deception and secures uniformity and certainty, and, official ballots being provided, in no wise restrains the right to vote; the privacy in which the voter is compelled to prepare his ballot promotes secrecy, avoids undue influence, discourages bribery, and paralyzes intimidation. These features would recommend the bill, even in the absence of the notorious and dangerous mischiefs which imperatively demand the adoption of a measure like this. But consider these mischiefs. It may be that in theory every voter selects his candidate from the body of electors when he goes to the polls; but in fact the candidates are selected for him by political organizations several days before election, and voting for candidates not previously nominated is unknown. It may be that in theory the voter prepares his ballots at the polls; but in fact they are printed and distributed by political organizations, and as a rule, so dependent is the voter for his ballots, if he found none at the polls he would be disfranchised. The necessity of providing and distributing ballots thus imposed on political organizations is responsible for the practice of assessing candidates, which has been so abused that the expenditure of a fortune is often a condition of candidacy, and corruption funds of startling magnitude are collected and used. All this so strengthens the organizations as to make the favor of these managers a prerequisite of candidacy and their enmity a bar to public office. Out of the large surplus of moneys collected for the distribution of ballots, voters are bought whose necessities make the pitiful bribe a tempting offer; and this bribery is made possible by our open mode of voting, which enables the briber to watch a ballot from the time he gives it to the voter until it is deposited in the box. Intimidation also plays its part, forcing the dependent citizen to vote what, for all practical purposes, is an open ballot; and in the confusion incident to elections as at present conducted, deceptive ballots are imposed upon the unsuspecting. To remedy some of these evils the legislature has required that all ballots shall be printed on white paper without any distinguishing mark; but it is common knowledge that the different sizes of ballots and the varying texture of the paper used nullifies the law, which, even if it were operative, would avail but little.

And now the electoral bill is offered as a complete remedy, the merits of which have been proved in the popular elections of Australia, England and Canada. Under it candidates could be selected with greater freedom than before; neither voter nor candidate would be dependent on any private individual or organization for ballots; all excuse for assessments would disappear, and with it the burdensome taxation of candidates and the vast funds which corrupt the franchise and threaten the freedom of elections. Even if corruption funds were otherwise collected, they could not be used successfully to bribe voters who immediately before voting were compelled to withdraw into the privacy of a booth and in secret prepare their ballots; and the same formalities that prevented the bribery of venal voters would make it impossible to intimidate the dependent, while deceptive ballots could not be used.

Such a bill is so manifestly in the interest of pure elections, so well calculated to secure to every voter that equal power at the polls which the constitution guarantees, and so free of unnecessary burdens on the exercise of the right of voting, while so well adapted to facilitate the orderly and untrammeled conduct of elections, that I am unable to imagine a valid objection to it which can be predicated on any supposed invasion of the right of suffrage. It is in strict accord with Chief Justice Shaw's description of an appropriate election regulation, in providing "an easy and reasonable mode of exercising the constitutional right, and one calculated to prevent error and fraud, to secure order and regularity in the conduct of elections, and thereby to give more security to the right itself."

You object that the bill hinders and impedes the elector in presenting whomsoever he pleases as a candidate, in canvassing the merits of candidates, and in the enjoyment of his liberty in selecting between candidates down to the moment of voting. These are rights which you hold to have been guaranteed, by implication, by the fundamental law.

But the bill, so far from hindering or impeding the voter in canvassing the merits of candidates, or in the enjoyment of his liberty of selecting between candidates down to the moment of voting, is intended to and does make these rights more secure than ever. The former is secured by official publication in advance of the election of the names of all candidates; and the latter by laying before the voter on an official ballot at the moment of voting the name of every candidate who has been nominated, with liberty to select between them or to reject them all in favor of any other name at his discretion.

Your complaint that the publication of candidates is confined to papers representing the two principal parties raises only a question of newspaper patronage. The object of the clause is to give notice, so that the right you demand for an elector that he "shall be allowed ample opportunity to canvass the merits of candidates, and to that end shall be duly informed who are candidates," may be accorded him; it seems to me it would have been unobjectionable had the bill limited the designation of papers to one instead of two. That newspapers are so much more convenient and effective for the purpose is the only reason for preferring them as a medium of publication to posting on the court house door.

Your complaint that the advertisement of nominated candidates is a discrimination against those who are not nominated raises no question. How is it possible to advertise candidates who are not nominated? And if to advertise a nominated candidate is to present him "to the public with a recognition and sanction which give him an advantage over a competitor" who has not been nominated, how is it possible, without discriminating against candidates not nominated, to enact any law under which "an elector shall be allowed ample opportunity to canvass the merits of candidates?" The notion that there is any substantial discrimination here has no foundation. The provision that the elector may write on his ballot the name of a candidate not previously nominated is clearly in the interest of the voter and for the purpose of preserving the individual privilege of nomination, however futile the exercise of that privilege would be, is now, and under any system must be. And these discriminations "between candidates because of the manner in which they are presented to the people"—that is, between candidates who are and those who are not nominated—are only a legislative recognition and sanction of established usage. When official nominations may be made by so small a number of voters as this bill requires, discriminations like these against a candidate who has not been nominated could not be seriously regarded as unjust or impolitic, even if it were constitutionally necessary to preserve individual liberty of nomination.

But I cannot agree with you that it is constitutionally necessary to preserve individual liberty of nomination or, as you express it, that "an elector may present whomsoever he pleases as a candidate for public office." No such right is expressly guaranteed by the constitution, and if it were it would be as competent for the legislature to require all candidates to be nominated, as it is to require all voters to be registered, a reasonable time before election. Such a regulation would no more infringe the right of choice in the one case than registry laws do the right of suffrage in the other, and we have already seen that such registry laws are reasonable regulations of the manner of conducting elections and not an impairment of the right of suffrage.

That electors may be restrained by law in some degree in the presentation of candidates has been determined, in effect, by our own courts. In People ex rel. Furman vs. Clute (50 N. Y., 451–458), it was claimed that a statute prohibiting the election of supervisors to the office of superintendent of the poor was unconstitutional for impairing the right of suffrage by restricting the voter's right to select from the whole body of electors. Unfortunately the office in question was not a constitutional office, or we should have had an authority directly in point. As it is, we have the benefit of the views of Judge Folger, who said:

It is not necessary in this case to determine whether the position of ecunsel is well taken, so far as an office created or continued by the constitution and thereby made elective is concerned; *though there are authorities which tend to show that as a general principle it is not.*

Among the authorities cited by Judge Folger were People vs. Fisher (24 Wend., 215–219), which held that a statute providing for the appointment of officers to fill vacancies during the interim between the creation of a vacancy and the next annual election was not repugnant to the constitutional provision that such officers should be chosen by the electors once in every year and as often as vacancies should happen. Also People vs. Snedaker (14 N. Y., 52) to the same effect, and Barber vs. People (3 Cowen, 636), in which the constitutionality of the statute punishing dueling by making the convicted person incapable of election to office was questioned. The statute was sustained by the court of errors. The reason given by the chancellor who wrote the opinion was that the statute was an exercise of the legislative power over crimes. But as the chancellor admitted that even criminals could not be deprived of the right of suffrage secured by the constitution, unless by express sanction of the constitution, it would seem that the decision would have been better placed on the power of the legislature to reasonably regulate eligibility to office. If, as the chancellor said, "the electors . . . are by the constitution wholly free to confer public stations upon any person according to their pleasure," and if, as was conceded, they cannot be deprived of this right even for their own crimes, it is difficult to see how they can be deprived of it for the crime of the man for whom they would vote. But that the legislature may for new crimes disqualify an elector from holding office is decided by this case, and that it cannot disqualify him from voting except for such crimes as the constitution specifies, was and must be conceded. The principle to be drawn from the case, therefore, is that the legislature may lay reasonable restrictions upon eligibility to office without being held to have invaded the constitutional right of suffrage. This was the ground on which the statute was sustained in the court below (Barber vs. People, 20 Johnson, 457). And Judge Folger, in People vs. Clute, expressed the same view when he said:

In Barber vs. People (3 Cowen 686) it is expressly decided that the legislature may affix ineligibility to office as a punishment for crime and not encroach upon the constitutional privilege of the elector. This was placed upon the ground that it is a part of the legislative or sovereign power of the state to maintain social order, and to take life, liberty and all the rights of both when the sacrifice is necessary. For the common weal the right of the criminal to receive the suffrage of the elector, and the right of the elector to give his suffrage to the criminal, may be taken away, and as social order may be preserved by the threatening of punishment for its infraction, *so it may be preserved by preventive laws rendering its infraction impossible.* Thus, in the case in hand, it was perceived that it was incompatible for an officer, who as superintendent of the poor was the temporary custodian and the almoner of the public moneys, to sit as supervisor in audit of his own accounts, and so for the prevention of the disorders which might arise from this incompatibility if permitted to exist it was within the legislative or sovereign power to guard against it by a limit in the special case upon the right to receive and the right to give a vote for the former office. *Will not the same principle sustain the right to the exercise of the same power in any similar and fitting case, whatever the office may be?*

The principle is recognized in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania constitution provided that vacancies in judicial offices should be filled by appointment until the first Monday of December succeeding the next general election; but the legislature provided that such vacancies should be filled at the next general election happening "*more than three calendar months after the vacancy shall occur.*" This act was decided to be constitutional (Com. vs. Maxwell, 27 Pa. st. 444). It was conceded by the court that a law intended to take away or *unnecessarily* and *unreasonably* postpone and embarrass the right of election would be unconstitutional; but it was held that the provision requiring three months for deliberation in the choice of a successor in case of a vacancy fixed only a reasonable time, and was, therefore, only a proper and valid regulation. And this decision, says McCrary ("Treatise on Elections," sec. 23) "goes upon the sound principle that a constitution can not enforce itself; it lays down fundamental principles according to which the several departments it calls into existence are to govern the people; but all auxiliary rules which are necessary to give effect to these principles must of necessity come from the legislature."

If the view is sound that in the absence of express constitutional restriction the legislature may, in the interest of good order, make reasonable and fitting regulations for eligibility to office (and it has the sanction of reason, and in principle the approval of authority), the electoral bill would not have been repugnant to the constitution even if it had restricted voting to candidates nominated a reasonable time before election. And, as I have already said, such a restriction would be strictly analogous to that of registry laws.

Your objection that "the bill leaves with the secretary of state and county clerks the absolute power of determining at their arbitrary discretion who are qualified voters competent to present a candidate by petition is not sound in my judgment. The functions of these officers are ministerial (electoral bill, secs. 9, 10, 29; McCrary on Elections, secs. 226–230, 252, 264, 265, 266; Gulich vs. New, 14 Ind., 93; State vs. Steers, 44 Mo., 223), and consequently for misfeasance they may be punished in damages and the damages may be exemplary if malice appears. They may also be punished criminally (electoral bill, sec. 31), and may be forced to act by mandamus. Many rights, including the right to vote itself, are no better protected.

The objection that "if a candidate should die or decline in the interval between his nomination and the election, no provision is made for a substituted candidate, would lie, if sound, if the bill required the nomination to be made fifteen or twenty minutes instead of fifteen or twenty days before election. The only question which the longer time raises is one of reasonableness.

I note your point that inasmuch as none but official ballots may be used, and as these must be obtained from the ballot clerks, the ballot clerks are armed "with an absolute control of the result of any and every election, for only such ballots as these clerks choose to deliver to voters can be cast or counted." The point is met by the principle that it is no answer to an election law that it enables the elective officers, by neglect of duty, to disfranchise electors. (Cooley's Const. Lim., marg. p. 602; Zeiler vs. Chapman, 54 Mo., 502; Nefzger vs. Davenport, 36 Iowa, 642; R. R. vs. Malloy, 101 Ill., 583; Ensworth vs. Albin, 46 Mo., 405). It could as well be argued that inspectors under the present election law are armed with "an absolute control of the result of any and every election;" they might close the polls or destroy the ballots cast, and it is only by a similar violation of duty that the ballot clerks could interfere with the elector's rights. The remedy is as obvious and effectual in the one case as in the other.

It is true that judicial power is lodged with the ballot clerks by section 24 to determine whether a voter who has destroyed his ballot has done so intentionally, and to give him a new ballot or not, according to their decision. The commendable object of the provision is manifest. It is to prevent a voter from maliciously tearing up one ballot after another to the inconvenience and possible prejudice of other voters. I do not share your apprehensions that the ballot clerks could so abuse this judicial power as "to control the event of an election" without exposing themselves to punishment. It must not be forgotten that the *malicious* abuse of judicial authority is punishable, and any such extensive abuse as to effect the result of an election would go far toward proving malice.

I think your objection to sections 21, 26 and 28 that an official ballot duly cast could be rejected for informality if the ballot clerks omitted to indorse it, embodies a misconception of the bill. The provision that "any ballot which is not indorsed by the names or initials of the ballot clerks shall be void and shall not be counted," does not avoid a ballot for mere informality. You have made the mistake of supposing that the ballot is official as it comes from the printer's hands; it is not official until the ballot clerks indorse it. Nor is this provision oppressive. The citizen, being presumed to know the law in matters of even greater moment than the casting of a ballot, would legally know that the clerks must indorse his ballot with their initials, as he now knows that a ballot must have no distinctive mark, and it would be the grossest carelessness on his part if he did not require them to do it. But it is not necessary to resort to the legal fiction as to knowledge of the law. Most citizens would in fact know the law, and a voter who did not would be protected by the inspectors, the watchers and the ballot clerks themselves, all of whom, ignorant of how he might vote, would be interested in having him vote in a legal manner, lest in the count the loss of his vote might diminish the vote for their candidate.

The period of five minutes for the preparation of ballots in the booth, to which you object, presents a question solely for the law making power. That there should be a limitation is obvious. The question is whether five minutes is reasonable. It certainly is ample for those electors whom you describe as preparing their ballots with caution, "meditating them for days, reconsidering and changing them down to the last moment;" they may be presumed to be intelligent enough to pass upon the merits of candidates before going into the booth and would lose no time in reconsidering after going in, because the most cogent reasons that now exist for changes at the last moment would under this bill be lacking. Whether there would be sufficient time for electors who might want to make nominations on the spot, something that would be seldom done and never effectually, or for infirm and semi-illiterate voters, experience alone can decide and I see no reason why when the time was apparently sufficient, it might not fairly have been left to the test of experience.

Having seen that the electoral bill is not unconstitutional on the ground that it embarrasses, hinders or impedes electors in exercising the right of suffrage, I now examine those reasons for your veto which are based upon the proposition that as to infirm and illiterate voters the bill destroys secrecy of the ballot.

By article II, section 5, of the constitution, it is provided that—

All elections by the citizens shall be by ballot, except for such town officers as may by law be directed to be otherwise chosen.

That "election by ballot means a secret one" is perfectly true; and I agree with you that "only by vailing their votes from those upon whom they are dependent can the poor and the weak cast their suffrages free from fear and influence," and that "the inviolable secrecy of the ballot box affords the only safeguard for the unbiased and untrammeled expression of the popular will in elections." I go further: It is only by vailing the vote of the dependent voter that the ballot of the independent voter can be assured its just weight and effect in giving expression to the popular will. Voting by ballot is not for the benefit of dependent voters alone, but as well for the benefit of all other voters whose voice in public affairs might be silenced by the countervailing votes of men inspired with fear.

It follows from the constitutional secrecy of the ballot that any regulation of the manner of conducting elections which promotes secrecy is in harmony with the purpose of the fundamental law. It is just this that the electoral bill aims to do. That in general it accomplishes the purpose is not and cannot be questioned, but objection is made to the following section:

Sec. 25. Any elector who declares under oath to the ballot clerks that he cannot read or write, or that by reason of physical disability he is unable to make his ballots, may declare his choice of candidates to either one of the ballot clerks, who, in the presence of the elector, shall prepare the ballots for voting in the manner hereinabove provided; or such elector, after making such oaths, may require one of such ballot clerks to read to him the contents of the ballot, so that the elector can ascertain the relative position of the names of the candidates on each ballot, whereupon the elector shall retire to one of the places, booths or compartments provided, to prepare his ballots in the manner hereinabove provided.

Referring to these clauses, you object that "since this bill obliges a certain class of voters to avow their votes to a person not of their selection or confidence, the bill, in my judgment, affronts the spirit and the policy, if not the very letter, of the constitution."

It is not at all certain that the bill obliges illiterate voters to avow their votes. It merely permits them to do so. Unless the avowal is an essential prerequisite to the exercise of the right, it is not compulsory; and I can see how illiterate voters might prepare their ballots as the law requires without avowing them to a ballot clerk. The bill evidently intends to afford every possible opportunity for this by providing that the voter may require the ballot clerk to read the contents of the ballot "so that the elector can ascertain the relative position of the names of the candidates on each ballot." But in the case of blind voters, disclosure would be a prerequisite to the right. The question is therefore fairly presented whether, under all the circumstances of the case and in view of the general purpose and effect of the bill, a disclosure such as is proposed by section 25 violates the secrecy of the ballot.

In the nature of their case blind voters must disclose their votes to somebody. To hold an election law void for involving that necessity would be to confine ballot voting to balls and cubes. Now, is it not clearly within the legislative power of regulating elections under a constitution that requires secret voting, to appoint officials sworn to secrecy, to whom, and to whom alone, those to whom disclosure to somebody is necessary, may disclose their votes. Would not such a regulation be in the direction rather of perfecting secrecy than of violating it? Suppose under our present system of voting the legislature should observe that blind and illiterate voters were from their infirmity misled or intimidated through necessity of submitting their ballots to unregulated inspection, and to remedy the evil should prohibit the exposure of their ballots to any but sworn officials, would the regulation, if otherwise reasonable, be void for violating the secrecy of

the ballot? Would it not justly be regarded as giving added security to secrecy?

One of the principal objects of the electoral bill is to secure absolute secrecy of the ballot—to deposit in the breast of the voter himself the sole evidence of his vote. To that end he is required to retire from observation, and there to designate the candidates of his choice on a ballot which, to remedy other mischiefs that threaten free suffrage, is officially provided. Having selected his chosen candidate, he must fold the ballot in such manner as to conceal its contents, and forthwith deposit it in the box. All this is in perfect harmony with the letter and spirit of the constitution as to secret voting. But here the legislature is confronted with the problem of voters to whom the disclosure of their votes to somebody is a necessity. An exception in their favor was manifestly essential to the preservation of their constitutional right of suffrage. In what form consistent with the highest degree of secrecy should that exception have been made? A voter of this class might have been permitted after receiving the official ballot to retire from the polling place for the purpose of reposing his "trust in some confidential friend for the preparation of his ballots." If that had been done I understand you would have found the exception unobjectionable. But such an exception would not have been in the interest of secrecy in voting; it would have been as destructive to secrecy in the case of dependent blind and illiterate voters as is the present system in the case of all dependent voters. It is not difficult to prophesy who the confidential friends of blind and illiterate voters in such a state of dependence or brutalizing poverty as to be subject to intimidation or bribery, would be. The legislature met this difficulty, wisely and constitutionally as it seems to me, by providing for a public officer to aid the helpless voter, and in doing so in the way they did they drew the veil of secrecy around the ballot of the infirm and illiterate as closely as it possibly can be drawn.

Mr. Waterbury and Mr. Anderson, whose joint opinion against the constitutionality of the bill you attach to your veto memorandum, and whose strong point of objection to the bill is its alleged violation of the secrecy of the ballot, quote the following from the American Cyclopedia, title "Ballot":

In England the ballot was proposed and received considerable support in the beginning of the eighteenth century, but it was not till 1830 that it became the subject of much discussion. In that year O'Connell proposed it in the house of commons and it received twenty-one votes. Mr. Grote, for several years afterward, was its most conspicuous supporter, but it had the approval of Macauley, Cobden, and at length Brougham, among many others less noted. It was finally adopted under the leadership of the Gladstone ministry in 1872 *with elaborate regulations to secure secrecy.*

The fact is overlooked by Messrs. Waterbury and Anderson that the Gladstone law of 1872 with its "elaborate regulations to secure secrecy," is substantially the same as the electoral bill and contains substantially the very provision for the benefit of blind and illiterate voters that is here objected to as inconsistent with secrecy.

This English law was adopted to prevent bribery and intimidation. It was adopted after a thorough examination of the system in operation here, which was rejected because it was not secret, parliament having already decided that a secret ballot was essential to the purity of the franchise. Under these circumstances, though the action of parliament is not, of course, conclusive of the constitutional question now in review, it is an important precedent showing that in the opinion of that body this provision for the accommodation of infirm or illiterate voters not inconsistent with the principle of secret voting.

As the result of my examination of the two constitutional questions which your veto presents, (1) that the electoral bill embarrasses, hinders and impedes the exercise of the right of suffrage, and (2) that as to a class it violates the secrecy of the ballot, I am of opinion that none of your objections on either point are sound.

There remain your objections to certain "serious, important and substantial defects," which you say it is conceded the bill contains:

(1) The omission to provide a means of filling any vacancy among candidates occurring within fifteen days of an election raises only a question of reasonable time, as I have already stated. Fifteen days is, it seems to me, short enough time for citizens to canvass the merits of candidates.

(2) You say the bill "omits to provide how the ballot clerks who are to serve at the first election to be held under the act are to be elected or appointed." By section 19 they are to be elected or appointed at the same time and in the same manner as inspectors of election. As the bill was not to take effect until January 1889, before which no ballot clerks could be elected, none would have been elected in time for the first election under the bill in places where inspectors are required to be chosen by election. But where inspectors are appointed, as in New York city, ballot clerks would have been chosen in time for the first election. The omission in respect to localities where there would have been no ballot clerks for the first election, could have been remedied at the next session of the legislature, and being merely technical, undoubtedly would have been so remedied. I concede the force of your claim that the executive should not sanction "an imperfect and mischievous measure" upon the contingency of future amendment. But this does not apply when the measure is not mischievous but highly meritorious, and the imperfection technical and trivial.

(3) It seems to me sufficient to require the ballots to be delivered to the inspectors before the opening of the polls, without fixing the exact time. As they cannot possibly be delivered more than fifteen days before the polls open, and the voting cannot begin until they are delivered, the time is fixed with sufficient definiteness.

(4) It may be true that "there is no good reason why counties should assume any part of the expense of municipal elections;" but the expense of municipal elections imposed on counties by this bill is so trifling that I cannot suppose you regard this as a substantial ground for your veto.

(5) It is not unusual in statutes to modify positive provisions, and this statute does no more when it allows persons not voting to be within the rail provided they have the authority of the inspectors, although they are otherwise excluded. There might be emergencies when it would be necessary. Any abuse which experience developed could be remedied.

(6) The requirement that "ballot clerks shall be named from the two principal political parties, refusing any representation whatever from the prohibition party, the labor people or any third party organization," is the same as the present laws relative to inspectors. Third parties have been allowed such representation by only one law, and that required that they should prove their right to it by first polling almost a plurality of votes.

(7) Your construction of section 28, that any slight informality whereby a single name is obscured would invalidate the ballot, is too narrow, in my judgment. I understand that the ballot is void only as to the obscured name. The clause reads: "Any ballot *or parts of a ballot* from which it is impossible to determine the elector's choice shall be void and shall not be counted." That does not vitiate a whole ballot for partial obscurity, but only the part obscured.

(8) Why is it necessary to designate the particular type on which the placard of instructions shall be printed? The spirit of the bill is that the placard shall be easily readable, and its words that it shall be printed in "large type." That is not a "vague and indefinite" provision. The bill might as well be required to describe the booths by feet and inches, or to specify, in stationers' terminology, the quality of the writing material, as to be less vague and indefinite in respect to the type of the instruction placard.

(9) The objection that no provision is made for paying ballot clerks does not point to a serious defect.

(10) To allow any person to be a candidate for a state office on the petition of one thousand electors, or for any other office on the petition of one hundred, certainly does make it very easy for the citizen to solicit the suffrages of his fellow citizens. This liberality was probably due to a desire to diminish to the minimum any discrimination between what are now called regular candidates and independent candidates. But it is certainly better that we should be "flooded with candidates possessing little share of public confidence or favor," and who on that account cannot be elected, than that by force of the existing vicious election methods we should be flooded with officials who possess little share of public confidence or favor.

The objections of Mr. Waterbury and Mr. Anderson, of Mr. Coudert and of Mr. Burrill, having been appended to your veto memorandum, may be considered in connection with your own.

In the joint opinion of Mr. Waterbury and Mr. Anderson it is said that "the constitution gives the elector a right to make up or obtain his ballot when, where, and as he pleases, and to include therein names of his own selection, whether candidates or not." If the constitution does this it is not expressly, but by implication. But that the voter has the right to obtain his ballot when, where, and as he pleases, cannot be implied, for that would nullify the superior implied right of the legislature to regulate the manner of conducting elections; and that the legislature may, by reasonable regulations, confine the elector's choice to nominated candidates I have already shown. Even if the bill limited the time when nominations might be made, that would not be adding to the constitutional qualifications for office; it would be a mere regulation analogous to the regulations imposed by registry laws, which, it is established, are not additional qualifications.

They also declare it "both novel and monstrous to declare an entirely innocent act, free from the slightest taint of crime, to be an offense punishable by imprisonment." This is an allusion to the penalty imposed on a voter by the bill for exposing his ballot, and thereby frustrating the object of a measure designed to purify the franchise. To declare this an innocent act exhibits a curious conception of innocence in a country where the ballot is a sacred institution; and to regard laws imposing imprisonment for acts that are innocent until prohibited shows a singular lack of familiarity with our revenue laws and police statutes.

Mr. Coudert doubts the wisdom of providing "that a qualified voter should be debarred from the right of exhibiting his ballots to his neighbor for the purpose of comparing views, of making inquiries as to the fitness of candidates, etc." But why a voter should require for this purpose the very ballot he is to cast, when the names of all candidates are officially published and accessible, Mr. Coudert does not explain.

Mr. Burrill objects to the bill as destructive of "the secrecy of the ballot," infringing "upon the constitutional rights and privileges of voters," and as in some respects "harsh, oppressive and unjust;" but gives no reasons for his opinion. His objections have been already considered.

I regret that this examination might not have been before you prior to your official action in the matter, but trust that it may be of service when the measure again comes up for consideration.

Very respectfully. LOUIS F. POST.

Organizing for Free Trade in Harlem.

A meeting of single tax free traders of the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth districts of this city was held on Tuesday night at the residence of John A. Picken, 158 East 114th street, to discuss the best means of advancing the movement during the campaign. Those present were John A. Picken, A. J. Steers, Dr. James Ferrier, A. W. Eastlake, W. O. Eastlake, Fred Bestelmeyer, A. M. Molina, Geo. H. Metzger, Martin Battle, Thos F. Byron, A. Fehrenbach, J. H. Dillon, James Bingham, and W. B. Scott. W. T. Croasdale, Louis F. Post, E. J. Shriver, Henry George, jr., and J. B. Chapman were also present from other districts. It was decided to organize for the purpose of carrying on an active free trade fight by means of debates, dissemination of literature and individual work. The meeting elected John A. Picken temporary chairman and adjourned to meet at the same place next Tuesday evening. All single tax free traders of these districts, many of whom were possibly overlooked when the call was issued, are invited to attend this next meeting.

THE DUTY ON TIN PLATE.

Mr. Jarrett's Admissions and What They Mean.

BROOKLYN, June 23.—At the George-Jarrett debate last evening at Palace hall, Williamsburgh, Mr. Jarrett made some peculiar admissions for a protectionist.

A man in the audience asked Mr. Jarrett if the Standard oil company, when exporting oil, did not receive a drawback on the tin cans containing the oil, to compensate them for the duty paid on the tin plate.

Mr. Jarrett admitted this to be a fact. Then the man asked if it was not acknowledged among business men that the larger the capital required the greater the difficulty of going into any business. Again the innocent protectionist acknowledged the fact amid audible titters from the intelligent audience.

"Well," said the questioner, "the duty is thirty-five per cent. You see the effect that would have, do you not? Mr. Randall's speech in congress must have been interested rant."

To the astonishment of all, Mr. Jarrett frankly stated that the protective tariff in this case fostered the monopoly of the Standard oil company.

Now this same rule applies to the whole subject of so-called protection. Let us consider in a few lines what it means to tax tin plate two cents per pound, or seventy per cent. Several years would elapse before the tin plate mills could get into running order; during which time the drawback would get in its work to the benefit of the Standard company But the mills are finished and the tin plate, worth seventy per cent more than English tin plates, is put on the market. We would then naturally expect to see the Standard oil company lock horns with the future American tin plate trust. But, no; by combination they would do as Mr. Jarrett frankly admitted we now do with canned fruits, vegetables, etc., that is, sell in such pauper countries as England for less than we do in this country, just to feed the poor things and to intensify pauper labor. The canned goods men would be in a bad fix. Australia or some other free trade country would soon convince the canners in the United States that competition was out of the question on account of this blessed seventy per cent protected tin plate, made by the American tin plate tariff association.

Col. Ingersoll's remarks at the railroad convention now being held at Chicago, about dog fennel, really related to tin mines in Colorado, and to the patriotic desire of the colonel that all true Americans should pay seventeen cents for a ten cent can of tomatoes.

This drawback question is a subject worth attention, and should, if nothing else will, cure some men, otherwise sensible, of their fifteen-year-old-girl-in-love style, who as an answer to free trade argument go into a frenzy over the name of Blaine, and should give an effectual answer to the old gentleman in the audience who propounded the following conundrum to Mr. George: If we had manufactured all the goods that we imported, would not this have given work to our army of idle men? Now, if American tin plate cannot be manufactured for less than seventy per cent more than English tin plate—instead of giving employment to more men, we would throw all engaged in canning fruits, vegetables, lobsters, salmon, etc., out of work, and force them to do what one deluded individual at the meeting told the writer he ought to do, go to a free trade country.

I think that the tin plate tariff association (if that is the correct name) had better not let Mr. Jarrett run loose.

FRED J. DEVERALL,
351 Bedford avenue.

A Small City on a Block.

Real Estate Record and Guide.

Work has been commenced on what may very well be called a small city, to be built on the block bounded by Tenth and Eleventh avenues, and Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh streets. John Ruck intends erecting there sixty-four tenements, forty-eight being without and sixteen with stores. The former will accommodate ten families in each building, and counting six persons to the family the total would be 2,880. The latter will accommodate eight families in each building, or a total of 768, making a grand total for the block of 3,648; or putting the matter in another way, the density of population at that spot of the city will be 912 to the acre. It is possible that these figures may be increased by building four of the houses on the streets extra deep, so as to accommodate 144 additional persons. For the sake of obtaining light and plenty of fresh air an unusual arrangement of the buildings has been decided upon. Those on the avenues will be 25x65, with the exception of the corner ones, which are seventy-one feet deep. Between these houses and the side walls of the buildings on the streets an open space twenty-nine feet at the narrowest part and thirty-five at the broadest will be left, so that a passer-by turning off from either of the avenues on to the streets would find, where the corner building terminates, an open space (usually occupied by a structure) between it and the first of the houses on the street.

On the Eve of Great Changes.

Rev. George Brooks of Loudon, in a letter to the Cincinnati *Christian Standard*, says:

What may be called social politics are attracting a good deal of attention in this country just now, and there are indications that even the liberal party, unless it radically changes its policy, will be unable to retain the more advanced of its adherents. The socialists pure and simple do not count for much, but the vastly larger number of people, mostly Christians and supporters of temperance, who are going in for sweeping land reform on Henry George's lines, are growing in numbers and influence every month. A meeting, with the promotion of which I had a good deal to do, was held at the City temple a week ago on the poverty question, and things were said at this meeting on land and landlords, taxation and rent, such as were probably never heard in a leading church before. What is more remarkable, the people present, mostly of the middle classes and including many ministers, were in sympathy with the speakers. We are on the eve of great changes in the old country.

American Labor.

New York World.

The sort of "American labor" that the millionaire manufacturers are so anxious to protect is shown by statistics of the nationality of the operatives in the Amory cotton mills at Manchester, N. H. Of the 800 "one-third are French Canadians and the rest of various nationalities, only eighty, or one-tenth of the whole, being native Americans." And the protectionist paper that prints these facts adds that "what is true of this company is also substantially true of all the great manufacturing companies in New England." This is the result of high tariffs on goods that all the people use and free trade in the "pauper labor" that produces them.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

Man made laws by which the violation of God's laws are legalized, and society to-day applauds men for becoming rich off the proceeds of labor which in the sight of God justly belong to labor.—[Dubuque, Iowa, Industrial Leader.

The George idea is the true one, and so long as there is a soul in man he will not rest until it is adopted and crystallized into law, for the truth once found can never be covered up successfully nor legislated out of the thoughts of men.—[Grand Rapids, Mich., Workman.

The taxing of railroad lands as they should be taxed would have the effect of rendering it unprofitable—and in many cases impossible—for railroad corporations to hold those lands at all. Just taxation would break their grip on the millions of valuable farming lands now held by them for speculation. That would make land cheap.—[Alpena, Mich., Labor Journal.

A vast majority of the large fortunes in the United States, as well as in Europe, had their origin in land monopoly. The rental value tax is the only plan yet devised to check this great and rapidly growing evil. Ireland presents an example of what the land question will be here in a few years if nothing is done to change the present system.—Council Grove, Kan., Anti-Monopolist.

The adoption of free trade is the initial step for escape from the wage earners' bondage. Privilege and equal law cannot co-exist in any society. "Protection" is the recognition by law of a privileged class. The labor of the poor man is his sole commodity; the "iron law fixes its exchangeable value. Here, where land is still cheaper than in Europe, the standard of living is yet higher.—[Chicago Laborer Enquirer.

There is no denying the fact that the land theories of Henry George are gaining ground very rapidly among the masses. There are evidences that the civilized portion of mankind are preparing to enter upon a revolution of opinion that is going to effect marked changes in the world's social fabric. When this revolution comes, as it seems certain to come, no other question will be affected as that of land values.—[Santa Barbara, Cal., Herald.

The present tax is mainly in proportion to what one consumes. An equitable tax will be in proportion to what a man receives from the community. The consumption of the poor is much greater in proportion to their means than the consumption of the rich. Therefore the present system drains heaviest the purse of poverty and attacks lightest the bank accounts of wealth. The rich are the ones that now monopolize values created by society. A tax on these values, therefore, will come heaviest on the rich and lightest on the poor. —[Detroit Evening News.

If a mechanic earns low wages, it follows that he can only pay low prices for all that he eats and wears and uses. If all our skilled workmen were suddenly to be reduced to fifty cents a day wages, it would give such a shock to the business interests of the city as has never before been felt by them. If such a thing could happen it would have one salutary effect at least. It would convince our business men once for all that their interests are identical with those of the working classes and that "an injury to one is the concern of all."—[Cleveland Workman.

What we are aiming at is, some way by or through which the great burdens which are now oppressing the agriculturist, the mechanic, the merchant and the day laborer may be relieved. That our taxes, direct and indirect, in the way of a tax upon our homes, upon the products of our labor, an internal tax and a tariff tax, burden us to such an extent now that it is oppressive, we begin to see, so that what we want, and what the people want, if they will consider the subject in the light of reason, and not in the dark of prejudice, is a reduction of taxes.—[Dayton, Ohio, Workman.

The tax reform memorial has only been in circulation in Texas about two months, and over one-fourth of the voters of Harris county have affixed their signatures to the document, and before the ides of November three-fourths of them will have signed the memorial. In other counties the work is progressing with almost equal results. By the time the next legislature assembles a roll of names will be laid before the solons that will cause them to rub their eyes and look again. The movement seems likely to assume the proportions of a ground swell.—[Houston Labor Echo.

A twenty-four acre piece of land lying near Kansas City, Kansas, which sold in 1875 for $2,200, now commands $100,000, and is not for sale at that. Another tract known as Spitlog tract, was recently purchased for $18,000 and is selling at $75 per foot. The ninety acres at that rate will bring $1,687,500. Nearly all the fortunes of Europe and America had their foundation laid in land monopoly. It now takes the total wages of 160,000 men to pay the ground rents alone of the Astor family in New York, which has all grown from $18,000 invested by John Jacob Astor less than a century ago. It is this increase of land values which we would take for public revenue.—[Topeka, Kan., Post.

Labor pays all the taxes now, and it will continue to pay all the taxes when the only source of revenue is a tax on land values. But the trouble is that labor not only pays all the taxes now for the support of the government, but it also pays tribute to a favored class to whom our laws give special privileges—the power to tax other people for the use of those natural opportunities which are not the result of human exertions. A tax on land values in lieu of our present system will relieve labor of all the indirect taxes it now pays, and it will take from the land holding class each year a sum sufficient to cover the expenses of a government economically administered.—[Detroit Evening News.

Of the twenty-two prominent anti-monopoly papers in Kansas, twenty sustain the Henry George land value tax, one opposes it slightly, and the other admits it has never studied the question and is not ready to take sides until it has done so. We have yet to see in the old party press the first attack or comment on the weak and meaningless land plank of the Cincinnati (union labor party) platform. The plutocracts know it is impracticable and harmless to the landlords, hence they let it alone, but all the vials of their wrath and mendacity are poured out on the land value tax advocated by Mr. George and his friends because they know it is dangerous to class privilege, is practical, and would prove effective. "See which side the devil takes, and then take the other," is an old and wise adage.—[Enterprise, Kansas, Anti-Monopolist.

Progress in Canada.

NEW FORT BARRACKS, TORONTO.—Our cause is growing here and making friends for itself. Rev. Mr. Van Wyck of the Euclid street Methodist church addressed the anti-poverty society, and is to all intents a true single tax man. He told us of a Dr. Watson who has gone so far as to detrmine not to touch land speculation in the future on account of the manifest robbery committed. This is the sort of thing that will make it an honor indeed to belong to an anti-poverty society. It is the sort of thing that will conquer in the end. The anti-poverty society is steadily pegging away, "ears back and a good solid grip on the subject," our treasurer, Mr. Douglass, being always in funds. Several of our speakers are taking turns in speaking in the park on Sundays.

We have just started a Commonwealth club, the only condition of membership being an agreement to investigate and spread the doctrine that the land belongs to all men, and that this right can be secured by a single tax on land values. Mr. Robert Emmett was elected treasurer and myself secretary; the chairman is elected at each meeting. Expenses are met by collections taken up at the meetings.

The Parkdale *Times* is devoting a large share of space to the work, its editor, Mr. A. G. Gowanlock, having become an ardent worker.

The *Labor Reformer* is also doing good work for the cause.

The *Globe* has several single tax men on its staff.

The *Mail* is doing really good work and is trying to open people's eyes to the fallacies of protection in a series of editorials. In short, we are gaining surely and steadily.

ROBERT CARTWRIGHT.

An Appeal to the World's Marseillaise.

Loud in terror cried the people, "France is doomed! Our cause is lost"—
Darkness, chaos, frenzied madness of a people passion tossed—
"Austria comes! The king has sold us slaves to Austria—death or chains—
Austria comes—Arms! arms! O nation!"—But confusion only reigns.
Hark! a hero-voice has answered, "Who will save the nation? I.
Give me arms and men, six hundred, men who know the way to die."
And they march, grim, stern, and silent, to the help of France enslaved;
They can die; but will not waver—France from tyrants must be saved.

Once again the wail's resounding—hear a needy people cry
For uplifting, for salvation, for men who know how to die.
See the workers, desperate, starving, huddled in a filthy den;
See the weak-eyed, sickly children; haggard women; hardened men;
See the idiot-heir of millions fawned on by the good and great;
And the robbers of the people voted rulers of the state;
Reason silenced; baseness flattered; evil called the only good;
God's eternal justice scouted with its claims of brotherhood.

Destitution, desolation, dumb despair on every hand;
Wealth abounding, gaunt eyed famine hov'ring o'er the fruitful land,
Weary toilers in the darkness groping blindly toward the light;
Goaded masses, revolution! might then is the only right.
Swift a crisis is approaching; it must be for death or life!
Time's past annals ne'er recorded half so desperate a strife.
Thinkers, wherefore are ye silent? Haste! the days are passing by!
O, have we no men among you; heroes, who know how to die?

Men who'll dare their master's hatred, e'en though children must be fed;
Men who'll firmly face starvation, knowing life is more than bread.
Who, like Socrates and Gracchus, live for truth—die in vain?
Martyrs answer, "No, for freedom, truth and justice we were slain."
With each martyr dies a million cowards; from their ashes spring
Mighty heroes, strong for action, fronting calm what life may bring.
Voices from the Russian prisons, voices from the scaffold cry,
Such are we, life's chosen freemen, heroes who know how to die.

Picton, Ontario. E. JOHNSON.

A Store Keeper's Views.

NEW YORK, June 25.—A most promising class for the advocates of the single tax to expend missionary work upon are the store keepers, of whom I am one. The great majority of them feel bitterly the pressure of the struggle for existence. Ever booming rents and war taxes leave the modern store keeper nothing but the crumbs of his business to live upon; even they are counted and measured and viewed with envy by the landlord, whose life is embittered by the thought that any part should slip through his fingers.

Time, observation and experience all teach me that you have discovered the worm that is gnawing at the root of our civilization; that our rivers of wealth empty into the landlord's bag; that wealth invests its holder with the power to rule, the natural sequence of which is that the men who own the land own the people, and in this species of slavery we find that the owner of the slave is under no obligations to support the slave.

I heartily approve of the stand you have taken and the course you are pursuing in the existing political struggle. If we cannot capture the whole loaf, let us be content with a slice. I honestly believe that if we can elect Mr. Cleveland upon the vital issue now before the people, we shall have advanced one step in the right direction. First of all let us strive to liberate from encumbrances what, in a broad sense, may be termed the "bread of life;" then let us turn our batteries against that greatest of wrongs which has imperceptibly grown upon the world until it is regarded as a right—the private ownership of the source of all life.

The extinction of an evil so vast cannot be accomplished in a day or a year. Like a fortress, it must be surrounded, besieged and approached, trench after trench, until it is forced to capitulate. O. H. WILMARTH.

Growth of the Free Trade Idea in Poughkeepsie.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., June 21.—A few months ago I observed in talking with single tax men here that a large number of them favored a third party, and perhaps I could trace predictions to a belief in the superstition of protection. But such has been the logic of events that a marked change has since come over them, and they support THE STANDARD'S position, and are out for the Mills bill and the radical declarations in the president's message, and are sure before long to advocate unrestricted trade.

This is of course a republican town, but the protectionists are looking blue, for working men are coming to ask why, during twenty years of war tariff, they have been tending steadily to the condition of European "pauper labor," and whether instead of demanding the restriction of immigration and clamoring for special labor laws, they had not better seek to destroy the special privileges which have built up and fostered the great monopolies. F. S. ARNOLD.

Wages of Farm Labor.

Philadelphia Record.

According to the report of the department of agriculture the present average rate of monthly wages for farm labor in the United States is $18.24 without board and $12.36 with board. In Pennsylvania the average is $22.24 without board and $14.50 with board. To dig a subsistence out of the land, either for himself or for hire, is the resource that stands between unskilled labor and beggary. The wages paid for farm labor is therefore an accurate measure of the general earning of unskilled labor. This is the form of labor which exceeds all other and upon which a "protective" tariff lays a constant burden without any compensating advantage.

THE BEATING OF THE DRUMS.

The democratic platform is one upon which all tariff reformers will with pleasure as they can with consistency stand. It was the best act of a wise deliberative body.—[Portland, Ore., Argus.

The tariff plank of the platform is all that could be desired. "We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection," are words which the *Press* rejoices to hear.—[New York Press.

The tariff is almost the sole issue in the coming presidential campaign, and Cleveland's message on that subject was appropriately made the democratic platform by the convention at St. Louis.—[San Marcos, Texas, Free Press.

A battle of principle at last. Thank God for it. The protective system is all wrong, and it ought not to be maintained another day; but the only way to bring the country to the knowledge of the truth is to make the fight in the open. Then let the cannon roar.—[Washington Post.

As a free trader, an advocate of a strictly revenue tariff, of course we are not enamored of the democratic tariff plank or Mr. Cleveland's explanation of it, but we do regard it as a step in the right direction for which there is urgent necessity.—[Muskegon, Mich., Business Gazette.

While the republican platform is unmistakably in favor of extreme protection it has no ringing sound. It lacks the directness and confidence of the utterances of the democratic platform in vindication of the policy of tax reduction and tariff revision as upheld in President Cleveland's message and embodied in the Mills bill.—[New York World.

Mr. Cleveland has made an issue on the tariff which no straddle in a platform or explanations on the stump can change. It is no longer possible for the democracy to be protectionists, revenue reformers or free traders, according to the demands of each locality. The Mills bill, it is true, reaches only a few specific articles, but the general principles of Mr. Cleveland's message mean that duties shall be levied only for the purpose of government.—[Chauncey Depew.

Its platform commits the republican party flatly against all reform of the tariff. Well, we congratulate the country that the republicans have committed themselves squarely upon the one question of which everybody is thinking, and on which the canvass ought to be and will now be made. They are for high taxes, and for wasteful and jobbing expenditures in order to perpetuate high taxes. The democrats offer against this, low taxes, economical administration and no surplus.—[New York Herald.

The contest is not between Mr. Cleveland and General Harrison, but between extreme protection and honest tariff revision; between a Chinese wall of prohibitory duties and a freer trade with all the world. The fight is one of principle, not of persons, and the *World's* opposition to Mr. Harrison is because he represents a principle which we believe to be antagonistic to the prosperity of the country and the welfare and happiness of the people.—[New York World.

With these nominations the country is launched upon a presidential canvass in which, for the first time in many years, every voter may rightfully take the liveliest interest. It is no longer a mere question of persons or of party spoils; the issue on which both parties appeal to the people is one which affects the pockets of every citizen, his comfort and welfare. A high tariff and low wages is the republican offer; free raw materials and high wages is the democratic offer.—[New York Herald.

Immigration is swarming. Nearly 3,000 Germans, Polish Jews and Italians landed at Castle garden yesterday. There is free trade in labor in this country. It is only the millionaire monopolists whom the tariff protects.—[Indianapolis News (Rep).

In view of Mr. Dana's frantic efforts to stem the free trade tide now overwhelming the democracy, an appropriate design for the top of the cupola on the coming *Sun* building would be a statue of Mrs. Partington tickling the edge of the Atlantic with a broom.—[New York Press.

We have on our exchange list more than 150 labor papers. Of this number less than a dozen advocate a continuance of the present tariff, while about one hundred and thirty-five favor tariff reform. This is a fair index of the sentiment of organized labor on the tariff issue.—[Indianapolis Labor Signal.

The Mills bill is a conservative measure of reform, and largely protective, though not protectionist, in its character. The man who affects to be afraid of it wants no reform at all and is no democrat, but a robber baron republican, who would plunder the people in the interest of monopoly.—[Louisville Courier-Journal.

In New Jersey, as well as elsewhere, agitation of the tariff issue will only the more clearly expose the mischiefs which the present system of monopoly and special privilege have inflicted upon the country's industrial development; and if any party have cause to dread this agitation it is not the democratic party.—[Philadelphia Record.

Borax is left on the free list of the Mills bill. Now expect a howl from the "defenders of American industry" because every blacksmith and washerwoman in the land is not to be taxed to heap up fortunes for a few California speculators in nature's gift to this country—a mine of borax. Tariff reform that makes no monopoly squeal is a sham.—[New York World.

We regret to notice an inclination in various quarters to evade, disguise, shirk, straddle and befog the question. It will not do, gentlemen. You are too late. President Cleveland's message has placed him and his party where hedging and trimming will not pay. The only safe policy is to stand up like men and fight for your faith, instead of forswearing it.—[Washington Post.

We firmly believe that Carbon county will roll up fully 1,000 majority for Cleveland and Thurman. We have good authority for saying that scores of laboring men, skilled and unskilled, who never before voted democratic, will do so this time because they are fully convinced that the existing tariff protects monopoly only, whilst the severest taxation burdens are put upon labor.—[Mauch Chunk, Pa., Democrat.

The Minneapolis *Labor Union*, a stanch advocate of the single tax, declares for Cleveland and Thurman. It says: "Under the present circumstances we consider that it will be really suicidal to the interests of labor for the workingmen to cast a divided ballot, and that they should therefore discard both the Cincinnati nominees. They should make their work tell this year, and they have a chance to do it without throwing away their votes.

John Jarrett and his employers went with their money into the district of Colonel Morrison to defeat him because he had opposed an increase of duty on tin plate. And now the house, in the absence of Colonel Morrison, votes to put tin plate on the free list. From this it would appear that the men who expended their money to defeat him did not gain anything by their little move. The Morrisons in congress have not only increased in number, but they have become more determined in purpose.—[Philadelphia Record.

As labor matters stand at present in Chicago, it is safe to predict that a vast majority of the laboring men will go over to the democratic party next fall. In the nominees of the union labor party or the McGlynn labor party hardly any interest is manifested by the laboring men in Chicago. The only question discussed at labor meetings is the tariff question, and an overwhelming majority of those attending these meetings are in favor of the progressive tariff policy of the democrats.—[Chicago Correspondence Rock Islander.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
12 UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK CITY.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, $2.50; six months, $1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

A BLOW AT ORGANIZED LABOR.

The court of appeals of this state has affirmed the decision of Judge Barrett dismissing the writ of habeas corpus in the cases of John E. Gill, John Foster, George T. Worley, James McDonald and John Campbell, held for trial on a charge of conspiracy. The decision is a deadly blow at trades unionism and the most important of its kind ever rendered in this state, yet our court of last resort is content to settle the great question at issue by its arbitrary dictum, without assigning a single reason for a decision that deprives thousands of our citizens of what they regard as a right absolutely essential to their protection against the grasping disposition of the employers of labor. This failure of the court to prepare a written opinion indicates that the judges either do not comprehend the far reaching results of their decision, or else that they do not feel that mere workingmen are entitled to know the grounds on which they are made liable to criminal prosecution and imprisonment for combining to maintain the existence of their trades unions and other labor organizations.

The facts that have given rise to this decision are simple and easily understood. In September, 1886, Gardiner & Estes, shoe manufacturers in this city, employed one Hart as foreman of their establishment. The men employed in their shop (collectively called a "crew") were Knights of Labor, and the shop was known as a union shop. As soon as the crew heard of Hart's engagement they remonstrated against it on the ground that he was a "scab," or non-union workman, who had the reputation of always trying to disorganize labor and cut down wages; his plan being to discharge one union man at a time and fill the vacancy thus created by a "scab" until the shop was made a "scab" shop. The crew after a conference with the firm agreed to give Hart a trial for a month, and subsequently extended the term of trial two months. Before the expiration of this time Hart discharged a workman named Potter, whom he accused of swindling the firm.

The crew believed that this was a mere pretext for beginning the usual process of making the shop a non-union one. But they did not, as the *Times*, *Evening Post* and other papers of that class at the time declared, insist on Potter's restoration whether he was a thief or not. They took the perfectly reasonable position that if Potter was a thief he ought to be prosecuted, and that if he was not there was no reason for his discharge; and they therefore demanded that he should either be prosecuted or reinstated. Hart was evidently not ready to prosecute Potter, who was thereupon reinstated during the temporary absence of Mr. Gardiner; but upon the latter's return Potter was again discharged. The crew again complained to the firm and made a request that the whole question be submitted to a committee of district assembly 91, Knights of Labor. To this Mr. Gardiner consented, but before the committee could even begin its investigation, Hart discharged every man in the shop.

This committee consisted of the men whose case has just been decided by the court of appeals. The quarrel, followed by a lockout, had already taken place before this committee became in any way identified with the dispute. In the course of the performance of their duty the Knights of Labor committee met a committee representing the employers' union. In reply to questions put by the latter, the K. of L. committee stated that the crew could not return to work for Gardiner & Estes so long as Hart was employed there, and they further stated that Hart would not be allowed to work within the jurisdiction of district assembly 91. Hart was not present at this interview, and the employers' committee was not charged with any message to him; yet this information, given by one committee to another as to the conditions on which a dispute could be brought to a close, was construed into a threat, and made the basis of a prosecution for a criminal conspiracy to commit an act injurious to trade or commerce and to prevent Hart, by means of threats and intimidation, from exercising a lawful trade and calling.

On this charge all the parties were arrested and were held by Police Justice Solon Smith for the action of the grand jury. Mr. Louis F. Post, counsel for Gill, sued out a writ of habeas corpus, insisting that the undisputed facts in the case showed that no offense had been committed, and that Gill was, therefore, wrongly held. Judge Barrett heard the case and denied the motion for the discharge of the prisoner. The court of appeals has now sustained Judge Barrett's decision that the facts as given do present a case proper to go to the grand jury. Pending this appeal, no further steps have been taken in the case, but it is to be presumed that the charge against the men named will now be pressed and that they will be brought to trial. Whatever may be their fate on a trial of the facts before a petit jury, this decision settles it as the law of this state that a combination of union workmen to refuse to work in company with a non-union workman is a criminal conspiracy which may be punished with fine or imprisonment, or both.

It is not our purpose to here discuss the legal soundness of the decision rendered by the court of appeals. It is sufficient to say that it differs widely from decisions rendered by other tribunals held in high respect by the legal fraternity of the whole country. Readers of THE STANDARD will not be surprised to learn that Judge Maguire of San Francisco has just rendered a decision diametrically opposite to that under consideration, and dismissed a suit brought by a non-union workman to recover damages from a union that had forbidden its members to work in the same shop with him. We have, however, read the argument in the Gill case, and it appears to us that the counsel made good his contention that there was no evidence of force, threats, or intimidation, and that the statement which it is sought to pervert into a threat was a mere matter of information. It is unquestionably a fact that a non-union man cannot work in company with union workmen in numerous trades, and that fact could have been communicated to the committee of the employers' union by any one. When did the communication of information become a criminal threat? Furthermore, Mr. Post effectively disposed of the other count in the indictment. He showed that the decision on which Judge Barrett relied was to the effect that a combination of workmen was to injure trade or commerce *because it tended to raise wages*, and that since that decision was rendered combinations to raise wages have been specifically authorized by statute. Considering the force of the argument thus presented, it becomes all the more remarkable that the court of appeals should have rendered so momentous a decision without even attempting to assign reasons for it.

The decision has been made, however, and it stands as the law of this state until the legislature shall interpose. Unless it is thus set aside the labor organizations of New York are shorn of their power. The statute authorizing combinations to increase wages is a dead letter from the moment that it becomes criminal for the members of trades unions to combine for the enforcement of their own rules. It is demonstrated by abundant experience that no sudden and temporary association of men to demand higher wages can reasonably hope for success, and that the only hope of securing or maintaining wages by combination lies in the preservation of permanent labor organizations, such as the trades unions and Knights of Labor. This cannot be done if the law as laid down in this decision by the court of appeals is enforced.

If a labor organization is to maintain its existence it must be able to secure certain things at the hands of its members. Among these are:

The regular payment of dues for the support of the organization.

Obedience to the rules and regulations mutually agreed upon.

Loyalty to the organization in the case of disputes or strikes.

How are these objects to be secured under the decision of the court of appeals? If a man does not pay dues, obey rules or stand by the organization in case of a strike, what can it do? Suspend or expel him, it may be answered. But what does even expulsion amount to if the matter ends there? It would only add another to the ranks of the non-union men, and thus tend to defeat the very object for which unions are organized. In order to make their discipline effective the unions must continue to prevent their members from working in shops with non-union men. Indeed, this power is necessary to prevent union men from being driven out of employment. In this very case the fear of the men working for Gardiner & Estes was that Hart would follow the course he had already pursued elsewhere, and, by discharging one union man at a time and putting a non-union man in his place, gradually make the place a "scab" shop. If the union men were to prevent this they had to resist in the beginning; for with the introduction of each "scab" their power to resist would have been weakened. Men

Undeniably the power of combining to refuse to work, and to prevent others from working, may be used tyrannously and cruelly, and to the impairment and denial of natural right. But the denials of natural right, which meet the laborer at every turn, compel him to this course in self-defense. With land monopolized, with legal restrictions upon productions and exchange, with great monopolies exercising almost unchecked power, and employers of all sorts banding together in trusts and combines, is he alone to be stripped of the power of doing what capitalists do with impunity? The evils of trades unions are begotten of restrictions. The remedy is not in more restrictions, but in the abolition of restrictions.

Organized labor cannot remain organized unless it has power to impose some penalty for the violation of its rules, and cannot continue to exist if it cannot even peacefully resist attempts to gradually weed out union men and put non-union men in the places thus made vacant. Yet under the decision in the Gill case, if a union attempts to enforce discipline or resist destruction by refusal to work with non-union men, its members become subject to imprisonment for criminal conspiracy. This is the situation that organized labor faces to-day, and the question for those concerned is, "What are you going to do about it?" There is no question as to what they can do. It ought to be easy for them to pledge every existing party to repeal by statute the law as laid down by the court of appeals, and if they will go about it properly they can accomplish this. The workingmen of England accomplished as much years ago when, as a class, they did not possess the power of the ballot.

New York is really far behind the times in the consideration of this phase of the labor problem. The solemn words of wisdom in which priggish and pretentious journals discuss the wickedness of strikes and boycotts are mere echoes of English utterances of years ago. The struggle in England was fiercer than it has been thus far here, probably owing to the fact that English workingmen had not the American confidence that some how and some time they could use the ballot effectively to put an end to the legal discrimination against them. The monstrous and damnable "Statute of Laborers" remained in force without material modification down to the year 1813, and with but slight modifications down to 1824. Justin McCarthy in his "History of Our Own Times," speaking of that period, says:

> The laws were particularly stringent in their declarations against all manner of combinations among workmen. Any combined effort to raise wages would have been treated as conspiracy of a specially odious and dangerous order. Down to 1825 the law continued to deal very harshly with what was called conspiracy among workingmen for trade purposes.

As late as 1867 the English courts were dominated by those mediaeval notions about workingmen which still prevail at Albany and Saratoga. They held that a trades union had no right to the protection of the law in enforcing a claim for debt, because the rules of the society appeared to be such as would operate in restraint of trade. The general objects of the trades unions were regarded by them as absolutely outside the pale of legal protection, so that it was held that a man could not be prosecuted for robbing a trades union. The societies thus outlawed had, in numerous instances, established their own methods of enforcing rules and regulations. The parliamentary investigation of 1867 brought facts to light that caused one universal outcry of horror throughout the United Kingdom. It is needless at this day to repeat the story of the trades union outrages in Sheffield, but it is not remarkable that the discovery that murder and arson were freely resorted to to enforce the discipline of the unions or to revenge insults to the union leaders should have created a bitter outcry against all unions for a time.

But the same investigation showed that the great majority of the unions had been free from any complicity in any crimes. And after society had shrieked itself hoarse over the Sheffield outrages, men of sense began to properly place the ultimate responsibility for these lawless acts by outlawed men. The unions continued to exist despite the clamor against them, and just men began to protest against including all workingmen in the denunciations called forth by the violence of a few. There gradually came a reaction. It was slow, however, to make itself felt, and not only the newspapers but the popular novelists, "fanatical on hearsay," continued to echo and inflame the indignant outcry of the "better classes" against the dreadful labor agitators. Justin McCarthy says:

> All the leading newspapers were constantly writing against the trades unions at one time, not writing merely as a liberal paper writes against some tory measure, but as men condemn a monstrous heresy. A comfortable social theory began to spring up that all the respectable, well conducted workmen were opposed to the unions, and all the ne'er-do-wells were on their side and in their ranks. The paid officers of the unions were described as mere cunning parasites, living on the strength of the organization. The spokesmen of the unions were set down invariably as selfish and audacious demagogues, who incited their ignorant victims on to ruin in order that they themselves might live in comfort and revel in popular applause.

How completely this description fits the conduct of certain newspapers in New York in our own time—newspapers that, while making special claim to wisdom of a high order, can only dully echo the stupidities uttered by the London press twenty years ago!

But in spite of tyrannical laws and adverse public opinion, trades unionism in England grew and prospered, and presently the unions startled the governing class into a recognition of their strength by their enormous processions during the reform agitation. Statesmen and politicians of both parties saw that here was a force to be taken into serious account, and then began a course of legislation which had by 1875 secured to the workmen of monarchical England a vastly greater measure of freedom than they enjoy under the laws of democratic New York, as those laws are interpreted by the court of appeals. Writing of this legislation Justin McCarthy says:

> The masters and the workmen were placed on absolute equality as regarded the matter of contract. They had been thus equal for many years in other countries; in France, Germany and Italy, for example. A breach of contract resulting in damages was to be treated on either side as giving rise to a civil and not to a criminal remedy. There was to be *no imprisonment, except* as ordered in other cases by a county judge; that is, a man may be committed to prison who has been ordered to pay a certain sum, and out of contumacy will not pay it although payment is shown to be within his power. *No combination of persons is to be deemed criminal if the act proposed to be done would not be criminal when done by one person.* . . . In principle this legislation accomplished all that any reasonable advocates of the claims of the trades unions could have demanded. It put the masters and the workmen on an equality. It recognized the right of combination for every purpose which is not itself actually contrary to law. It settled the fact that the right of combination is just the same as the right of an individual. The law had long conceded to any one man the right to say for himself that he would not work for less than a certain rate of wages. It now acknowledged that a hundred or ten thousand workingmen have a right to combine in the same resolution. It admitted their legal right to put this resolve into execution by way of a strike if they so think fit. . . . Then, to carry the exposition a little further, an association of workingmen have a perfect legal right to endeavor to persuade other workingmen to adopt their views, accept their resolution, and become members of their union. They have a right to say that any one who does not agree to their rules shall not become or shall not remain a member of their society. Further and finally, they have a right to say that they will not work in the same establishment with men who have acted in such a way as in their opinion to do injury to the common cause of the trade.

The organized workingmen of New York, with the ballot in their hands, can certainly accomplish what English workingmen have accomplished by mere parades of non-voters. Let them protest against the law that punishes their combinations as criminal conspiracies, while it permits trusts to flourish and aldermanic "combines" to go unpunished. Let them insist on affirmative legislation declaring that it shall not be unlawful for any number of men to combine to do that which, if done by one man, would be lawful, and let them see to it that any party that does not promise this in its platform shall not control legislation in this state. Such a course applied to one great measure at a time will assure success. If trades unions are to continue to exist in this state their members must set about rescuing them at once from their impending doom, as pronounced by the court of appeals.

A CAMPAIGN "STANDARD" FUND.

Some weeks ago Mr. W. J. Atkinson of Philadelphia, stating that in his opinion the coming up of the tariff question opened a field of the widest usefulness for the general circulation of THE STANDARD, sent us $500 to be used as the nucleus of a fund for distributing copies of this paper during the campaign. Mr. Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland about the same time sent a similar message with another $500. It was deemed best to wait until the campaign had fairly begun before announcing these contributions in the columns of THE STANDARD. In the meantime a number of other gentlemen to whom the suggestion of Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Johnson had been communicated have also sent subscriptions. The list at present is as follows:

W. J. Atkinson, Philadelphia	$500 00
Tom L. Johnson, Cleveland	500 00
A. J. Moxham, Johnstown, Pa.	100 00
W. Symington Brown, M. D., Stoneham, Mass.	5 00
L. O. M., New York	10 00
R. G. Brown, Memphis, Tenn.	10 00
Read Gordon, Roselle, N. J.	100 00
"Friends of THE STANDARD," Johnstown, Pa., per A. J. Eldridge	7 00
"Workman," Ilion, N. Y.	5 00
"No Name," Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	5 00
	$1,242 00

We have also received the following promises of monthly or weekly subscriptions until the close of the campaign:

An Oregon Friend, $2.50 and $2.50 per month; Dr. Walter Mendelson, New York, $6 and $6 per month; Simon Mendelson, New York, $5 and $5 per month.

Making $13.59 received as first installments of monthly subscriptions to the same amount, which gives a total already received of $1,255.50.

We have already used a part of the money thus received in sending out a large number of STANDARDS and a considerable quantity of tracts; but to vigorously prosecute the work larger resources are needed. In making the distribution we have thus far used lists furnished by our friends in various places of men likely to receive our ideas, and it is on this line we propose to work. The tariff discussion is opening the minds of hundreds of thousands to a consideration of the very subjects that we are endeavoring to call attention to, and large numbers who have hitherto regarded us with prejudice are now so far awakened as to be ready to consider, and even to welcome, our views. An occasional copy of THE STANDARD or a timely tract may at least give to such men some comprehension of our purposes, or plant in their minds a thought or a suggestion that will leave a permanent impression and make them centers for the diffusion of our principles.

We can in this way make a lodgment for single tax principles in localities where as yet they have not been understood, and imbue with them men who from their connection with existing parties are in a position to gradually but powerfully aid in their dissemination. There are now tens of thousands of men eager to enter this campaign as speakers, and anxious to distinguish themselves in local discussions, or who are being warmed to the subject by the controversies which are now going on in shops, in stores, in offices, and wherever men meet. These men are searching for light on the new issues which have been precipitated on the country. They will eagerly accept our reasoning and use our arguments if presented to them.

They are in the frame of mind to see, and in the mood to proclaim, in response to protectionist appeals, that it is not our tariff duties, but the easier access which labor has had to land that has made wages higher in this country than in Europe. And as the contest waxes warm they will be impelled by the ardor of conflict to come, even before they fully realize it, to the firm ground which we occupy—the injustice and impolicy of taxing anything which will increase the sum of wealth.

We invite all of our friends who can afford to do so to contribute to this fund. Contributions will be announced in the name of the contributor unless otherwise ordered. We should also be glad to have them give us at the same time the names of persons to whom papers might advantageously be sent. And those who cannot afford to make pecuniary contributions may also help the work by sending us the names of persons of this kind. We especially desire the names of such persons in localities where as yet little or nothing is known of the single tax movement. Wherever we can get one man imbued with our principles we are certain ere long to find a number of others.

With the same general idea as that which animated Messrs. Atkinson and Johnson in proposing a campaign recruiting fund, Mr. Thomas G. Shearman recently sent us an order for nearly 1,600 recruit subscriptions to THE STANDARD. He also ordered us to distribute at his expense 50,000 of the tracts containing his free trade speeches. We can furnish these tracts free of charge, as far as Mr. Shearman's order goes, to those who will distribute them judiciously. We have already sent a number of them and of copies of THE STANDARD into Pennsylvania, where the miners especially receive our literature with avidity.

Here are some letters from those who have sent us subscriptions:

STONEHAM, Mass.—Free trade is the question of the day, and THE STANDARD is just the paper to inculcate it on its own merits. That was my opinion more than a year ago, when I asked you to issue a cheap edition of "Protection or Free Trade?" THE STANDARD is the best newspaper I have ever seen. It is truthful, civil and spicy. A dear old friend of mine in Worcester, who works every day at the anvil, after receiving a few copies, wrote to me: "Send me THE STANDARD for a year. It is the only paper I can read after supper without falling asleep over it."

By all means, send it to workingmen who are deluded by the idea that a protective tariff raises wages. I inclose my mite to help to do so.

I have prepared a lecture on "Protection," and delivered it in five towns in Massachusetts. Expect to resume lecturing in September. W. SYMINGTON BROWN, M. D.

MEMPHIS, Tenn.—I heartily believe in the idea of raising a campaign fund to distribute our paper as a campaign document as widely as possible, and am glad of the opportunity of rendering in this way effective service to free trade and to the single tax; for, in my opinion, the one is but a precursor to the other; and by inducing a widespread discussion of the principles underlying the first, we shall certainly bring many to consider the claims of the second and the arguments we advance in support of our fundamental article of faith. I send you $10, to be put to the subscription for a campaign fund, or to be used for recruit subscriptions, where you deem it of greatest advantage. I am "in for the war," regardless of the location of the battle field, satisfied, as I am, that anything which induces men to think of the relations of land, labor and capital, is certain to induce "the superior minority" to give us least a hearing for the message we have to deliver.

R. G. BROWN.

NEW YORK.—I beg to offer a subscription to be used in extending the influence of THE STANDARD in the coming campaign (as well as permanently) and to express my hope that the "open door" may never be closed, but gradually enlarged until the American people see no necessity for a jamb on which to hang a door, or a wall to fit a casing into, and all interference with an absolute freedom of exchange becomes a matter of ancient history. Please find check for $100. READ GORDON.

PORTLAND, Oregon.—I think it very important that THE STANDARD should be widely circulated during this campaign. I send you $2.50 for that purpose, and will continue to send you $2.50 per month until the election is over, and doubt not that many others of THE STANDARD's readers would gladly do the same. We expect soon to organize a Henry George club here, after which we hope to largely augment your subscription list in this section. "AN OREGON FRIEND."

179 WEST SEVENTY-FOURTH STREET, NEW YORK.—No more effective work could be done to spread a knowledge of the truths of free trade than to scatter THE STANDARD as widely as possible wherever men are congregated and where discussion must needs arise during the coming campaign. We should be glad to contribute $6 a month to a fund for that purpose. My father is absent in Europe, but until he can be heard from I can undertake also to subscribe $5 a month for him.

No paper that I know of has the art of putting the question so forcibly and interestingly before the public as THE STANDARD, and none—as I was recently told by one who has good reason to know—gets at the heads and hearts of the people so well.

If I might make a suggestion, it would be this: To spread THE STANDARD and tracts where economic ignorance is densest and industrial distress most frequent and intense—as the coal and iron regions of Pennsylvania—for I think it is a common observation that at such times as are now upon us, when public thought is most highly stimulated, men are comparatively easily led to swing round into a mode of thought the opposite of the one they have long entertained. And this does not result from mere fickleness or caprice, but from the same reason as that which leads one who has been surrounded by darkness to be most impressionable to light. So a mind long imprisoned in the darkness of ignorance often grasps a truth in its simplicity and entirety more readily than one which long has been groping about amid the confusion of dimly perceived half-truths.

So I would say, concentrate efforts on those who have most been deluded and robbed by the tariff. Their empty stomachs cry out against it now. Soon their filled intellects shall do so too. Cordially years,

WALTER MENDELSON.

INTERESTING TO FARMERS.

In Michigan, as elsewhere in the west, the cry is raised that to concentrate taxes on land values would be to make the "poor farmer" pay all the taxes. Now according to the Chicago *Herald*, the dividends paid by the copper mining companies of Michigan amounted in 1886 to $1,900,000, the greater part of which was paid by the Calumet-Hecla mine. The eighty-acre tract held by this corporation was bought originally for $100, and was subsequently purchased by the present corporation for $60,000. Ten years after it was valued at $13,000,000, and to-day its value is enormously greater. The entire revenues of the state of Michigan in 1860 were only $1,683,560, and to-day are not greater than the copper dividends alone, of which the largest part consists of land values. Add to these the value of the immensely valuable iron lands, the salt springs and the timber lands, and it can readily be seen that a tax on land values that did not take one penny from the farmer would much more than suffice to pay all the present expenses of the state of Michigan. Add to these values again the land values of the cities and towns, and it can be seen how much the taxes of Michigan farmers would be reduced were all taxation removed from personal property and improvements and public revenues raised from land values alone. The truth is that the value of Michigan farms consists mainly in improvements; and that were speculative values destroyed, as they would be by the single tax, the farm would have little or no taxes to pay. When the farmers begin to see this, as they are beginning to see it in Texas, the strongest demand for the single tax will come from the agricultural sections.

Senator Ingalls of Kansas is a howling protectionist, who insists that we shall keep the American market for American productions. Yet George W. Knight of San Marcos, Texas, sends us an advertisement from a Texas paper in which a large cut of Senator Ingalls, all shaven and shorn, except as to moustache and goatee, surmounts an extract from a special Washington dispatch, dated September 11, 1887, to the New York *Tribune*. In this, as preface to something complimentary to a certain soap, Senator Ingalls is made to say:

> I think a man looks better when he is shaved. Every man should shave. I always shave myself. As part of one's regular toilet every morning it does not take much time, and it does not cost more than a cent. Take my advice—shave.
>
> Buy a Swedish razor; the Swedish is the best; it will cost you $2, while an ordinary razor would cost you only $1; but it is worth the difference.

Will not the *Press* look into this matter?

The latest issues of the "Land and Labor Library" are "A Short Tariff History" and "Plain Talk to Protectionists," both by Thomas G. Shearman. These tracts are efficient campaign documents, and will be useful to readers of THE STANDARD who want to set their friends and neighbors to thinking in the right direction. They should be given the widest circulation possible.

A Big Opportunity for Ohio Single Tax Men.

CINCINNATI, June 23.—I wish through your paper to call the attention of the single tax men of Ohio to the fact that "the committee appointed at the last session of the general assembly to revise the tax laws is to begin operations on July 31. The committee consists of D. M. Massie, of Chillicothe; P. M. Adams, Tiffin; W. T. Cope, Salineville; W. H. Reed, Chillicothe, and W. A. Braman, Elyria. In the time intervening between now and the date for regular work the commission invites all persons interested in tax reform to write to some member whose address is given above, and present their views on the subject. It is conceded that the tax system is far from what it should be, and the committee is desirous of getting all the information possible on the subject, and therefore invites correspondence and suggestions, and asks that the press make its desires known."

It would be well for some concerted action to be taken in this state toward impressing the committee with our views.

C. S. WALKER.

What Cripples England's Trade.

Thomas Briggs of London, writing of the depression of trade and agriculture in England, says:

> One of the largest of my ventures was made ten years ago in what was then bearing an 8½ per cent dividend. It is one of the largest and most respectable of coal and iron works with a working capital of £4,000,000; but having to pay about £80,000 per annum for royalty, the amount available for dividend is reduced, through the commercial depression, from 5 to 2½ per cent. Now this royalty is a robbery, claimed by one person because he owns that portion of the earth's surface, or is what is called the lord of the manor; and no matter how depression of trade reduces the profits of the concern and the wages of the men who risk their lives in the bowels of the earth some hundreds of feet under ground, this lord, who does not lift as much as his little finger, must be paid to the uttermost farthing.

For the Same Reason Residents of Other Cities Become Tax Reformers as Soon as They Understand Single Tax Doctrine.

Council Grove, Kansas, Anti-Monopolist.

If you want to know why residents of cities are generally tax reform men, go no further than Topeka and see how impossible it is for a poor man to hope to own his own home, and how large a share of his earnings goes to enrich his landlord—or, land god, for the meaning of the two words is the same. Houses fifteen blocks from business rent for $20 per month, when $5 would pay good interest on cost of building, the other $15 being interest on value of the 25x120 feet lot. We were shown a $50 shanty standing on a 25x120 feet lot for which the builder and occupant of the shanty paid his very wealthy land god $20 per month. The lot was just as nature left it, except for the shanty, and but a few years ago was bought for $75. There are thousands such vacant lots, held for a rise, and already too high for working men to buy, or, if bought, the interest on cost of lot is equal to perpetual rent and consumes the earnings of the occupant.

MEN AND THINGS.

New York has been having experience of a "hot spell." To some this has meant nothing more than an excellent excuse for fleeing to the mountains or seaside; to a larger number it has been the cause of a good deal of inconvenience, alternated with refreshing visits to near by ocean resorts. But to the majority of the city's inhabitants the torrid weather of the past week has been an indescribable suffering; and to not a few, especially among the babies, it has brought death.

It is curious, the equanimity with which, year after year, we note, and speak about, and mildly regret, the frightful suffering of the dwellers in our great cities during the heated term. We get excited over the possibilities of war, and make lurid prophecies of New York bombarded or held to ransom. We tax ourselves without stint or hesitation to provide ships and guns, which are useless during peace and would perhaps be worse than useless in the event of war. And yet year after year we allow thousands of human lives to be wasted, and scores upon scores of thousands of human beings to endure agonies equal to those that have immortalized the prison ships of the revolution, and make no effort toward any radical reform that shall put an end to them by rendering them impossible. We try, indeed, to lay a plaster on the sore. We pass laws for the better regulation of tenement houses, and give power to the board of health to visit, and inspect, and order alterations; but we watch, with equal mind, the long rows of hives extend, and never try to strike at the root of the evil and sweep the tenement houses out of existence once and forever.

Yet nothing less than this can bring relief. No amount of sanitary legislation, no supervision of charitable societies, and district visitors, and boards of health, can ever do away with the physical suffering and moral degradation which result from the herding of human beings like cattle in corrals. All the laws on the statute book cannot make a home of two rooms in a tenement house, with the street as a play ground for the children. The evil to be fought is not the wrong doing of the individuals who build tenement houses in response to a popular demand, but the social crime which so compels men to idleness, and so robs them of the product of their labor, as to render it impossible for them to live as men should live—to surround themselves and their families with those gracious home influences on which the true prosperity and happiness of the republic must be founded. It is inexpressibly pitiful that children should be smothered out of life by the forced overcrowding of our cities; but the slaughter of the innocents is not the worst evil of our tenements. The children who survive will bitterly avenge their slaughtered brothers and sisters.

The people of Norfolk, Va., are anxious to make the most of the natural advantages of their city. They have one of the finest harbors on the Atlantic coast, easy of access from the interior and from the ocean, free of ice throughout the winter, and with water sufficient to float all but the very largest of modern seagoing vessels. They see very clearly that it is to their interest to induce as many people as possible to make use of these facilities. Every bale of cotton, every hogshead of tobacco, every bushel of grain, every barrel of naval stores, that is brought by rail or boat to Norfolk and carried thence by steamer, gives employment to Norfolk laborers. The greater the earnings of laborers, the greater will be the business and profits of store keepers, house builders, bankers and others engaged in purely local industries. Trade begets trade. The vessels leaving Norfolk for domestic and foreign ports bring back cargoes of goods to be dispatched to interior points, or held in Norfolk warehouses for merchants from less important places to come and buy. It is by processes such as these that great cities are developed. If Norfolk can induce enough people of the United States to use her harbor as the gateway through which to send their surplus products she can easily become the rival of New York.

The Norfolk people have just given practical evidence of the faith that is in them. The Richmond and Danville railroad company, desiring a more convenient outlet to the sea than they have hitherto been able to secure at Richmond or West Point, have been considering the advisability of establishing a terminus of their system at Portsmouth and Norfolk. The Norfolk people got wind of the matter, and promptly showed their disposition to meet the railroad company half way. The result is that the city council has, at the request of the Cotton exchange, leased to a corporation forming part of the Danville system, an entire square of land, with one of the best water fronts in the city, at $500 a year—probably less than five per cent of its real value. The lease is a conditional one, to become operative only if the Richmond and Danville system brings its business to the port. The railroad company is said to be satisfied with this concession, and the building of the necessary line of road is to be begun at once.

The queer thing about this transaction is that the people of Norfolk, seeing so much of the truth as they do, should not be able to see more of it. Apparently they appreciate the fact that men will come to Norfolk and engage in wealth production there, or stay away, according as they find access to Norfolk's natural opportunities easy or difficult. If, instead of allowing the railroad company the use of the natural opportunity of that wharf site at $500 a year, the common council had demanded $5,000 for it, the company would have been less inclined to come. If $50,000 a year had been demanded it is almost certain that the negotiation would have fallen through. The council wisely fixed the rental so low as to make access to the natural opportunity practically free; and the result will be a direct benefit to the city.

But if it is a good thing to have one railroad company bring its business to Norfolk, why wouldn't it be wise to induce other railroad companies to do the same thing? And why stop at railways? Why not make the same effort to induce merchants, store keepers, manufacturers, laborers, school teachers—men in every sort of industry to come too? Every man who comes to Norfolk and goes to work must benefit the city. It is only the drones in the hive who are utterly useless. And the same methods precisely that are inducing the Richmond and Danville road to come would induce wealth producers of almost every other kind to come too. Wherever natural opportunities exist, there the workers want to go; wherever access to the opportunities is free, there the workers *will* go.

A tobacco manufacturer, for example, wants to start a factory in Norfolk. The same difficulty confronts him that stood in the way of the Richmond and Danville railroad. He must have land on which to build his works—a site for his factory—the access to natural opportunities. A store keeper would gladly establish himself on Main street—a teacher would like to open a school—a laborer wishes to go there for employment. Every one of them must get the use of land to work on, and live on, or he cannot come. But the tobacco manufacturer, and the store keeper, and the teacher, and the laborer, are less fortunate than the Richmond and Danville railroad. When they go looking for natural opportunities—for the privilege of using land—they have to deal with private individuals who "own" the land and demand a share of what the manufacturer, and store keeper, and teacher, and laborer, can make before allowing them to use it. And the consequence is that all of them, and tens of thousands of others like them, do just what the Richmond and Danville railroad would have done under the same circumstances—they stay away from Norfolk. And Norfolk is by just so much the worse off.

In making their grant to the Richmond and Danville road, the people of Norfolk have made an abortive attempt to take advantage of a great economic principle. Who will reap the benefit of this utilization of Norfolk's opportunities? Not the *people* of Norfolk—the men who work with their hands, and on whose labor the prosperity of Norfolk rests. Their wages will be no whit the better because of the advent of the new enterprise. But the men who own Norfolk—the men who have had the foresight, or the luck, to get control of the land on which wharves, and warehouses, and stores, and dwellings must be erected—will be the chief beneficiaries. And in future the manufacturer, or store keeper, or professional man, or laborer, must pay a heavier tax than ever before for the privilege of exercising his powers of work.

But suppose that instead of giving to one corporation the privilege of using natural opportunities almost free of charge, while allowing all other industries to be taxed for the benefit of individuals—suppose, instead of this, that Norfolk could annually levy on every one controlling natural opportunities a tax equal to the annual value of the opportunity controlled. What would be the effect? First, that every person controlling a natural opportunity—a wharf front, or a building site—of which he himself was making no use, would be compelled, since he could make nothing by holding it, to abandon it to somebody who could and would utilize it. Second, that any manufacturer, or merchant, or professional man, or laborer, would be able to establish himself in Norfolk without first purchasing permission, at a competition price, from some Norfolk owner. Third, that the more the land values of Norfolk increased, the greater would be the revenue to be disposed of in public improvements and facilities for the equal benefit of every citizen of Norfolk, rich or poor. And, fourth, that the great mass of the people of Norfolk—the workers for wages—could never be forced to accept as wages less than the whole product of their labor; since they could at any time apply that labor to natural opportunities yet unused, and thus become their own employers.

An English law for the regulation of the sale of food products provides a penalty for exposing oleomargarine for sale except in a package labeled "margarine." A village grocer, recently arrested for violating this law, made the ingenious defense that he kept his oleomargarine beneath the counter, out of sight, and therefore did not "expose" it. The magistrate decided that no offense had been committed.

The late teller of the Union bank of Providence seems to have studied the story of the Manhattan bank defalcation to some purpose. "Take enough to cripple the bank, and compromise by returning a portion of it," was the advice given by Lawyer Dunn to Teller Scott of the Manhattan company. Mr. Pitcher has improved upon this plan. He appropriated property of two kinds—cash, which he could use himself, and notes and other evidences of indebtedness, of which he personally could make no use, but which would be of the very greatest use to the bank he was robbing. Thus, having withdrawn himself to Canada, he is in a position to make a compromise on terms altogether advantageous to himself; offering to return the securities, which he can't use, on condition of being allowed to retain the money. Whether the bank will accept this proposition or not—if the defaulter has really made it—remains to be seen. But if the securities held by Pitcher are of sufficient value, there is little doubt that the directors will prefer to let the crime go unpunished rather than involve the bank and themselves personally in a common ruin. Mr. Pitcher, vulgarly speaking, has got them in a cleft stick. And it is safe to say that if they do compound the felony no business man will blame them. It is all very well to talk about the encouragment of vice by such compromises; but the men who are quickest to see and point to the evil when the bargain is made by somebody else are often the readiest to make composition when it affords the only method of averting pecuniary disaster to themselves.

It is a crime to rob a bank. It is also a crime to condone the robbery on condition of partial restoration of the property stolen. And in the last analysis the same moving cause underlies both crimes—poverty, or the fear of poverty. Men steal, or compromise with thieves, not for the pleasure of theft or from any desire for its encouragement, but lest a worse thing befall them. The bank official who speculates and loses, and then robs his employers to make his losses good and continue his speculations, is urged along by no mere love of speculation, but by the knowledge that in the race of life a certain number must be left behind, and the fear lest he may become one of the laggards. And the employer who accepts a moiety of the money stolen and lets the thief retain the balance, does so from precisely the same feeling—the fear of being reduced to poverty. Thus social crime breeds crime in individuals. "The fathers have eaten of sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge."

Mr. D. O. Mills has presented to the city of New York a school for trained male nurses, at which young men anxious to adopt nursing as a profession will receive a two years' course of suitable instruction. The school will be located in a specially erected building on the grounds of Bellevue hospital, and will be under the control of the commissioners of charities and corrections. The cost of the institution, which is to be defrayed entirely by Mr. Mills, will be about $100,000.

In making this gift, Mr. Mills has approved himself a kindly hearted citizen. But it ought not to be forgotten that if the city of New York were in receipt of the revenue that properly belongs to her—if she collected for the public use that magnificent income of land values which is now appropriated by private individuals and corporations—she would have no need to be indebted to private munificence for public institutions of any kind, however costly.

There is too much bumptiousness about the mugwumps and too much mugwumpery among the civil service reformers. The result is that now and then the men who see the promise and potency of political purity and social regeneration in an improved method of obtaining government clerks get sat down upon. This has happened to George William Curtis and a number of his associate mentors quite recently. They have been criticising Secretary Fairchild for certain removals and appointments he has recently made in the New York custom house until the secretary has been goaded into writing a letter to Mr. Curtis explaining his action in the premises. He makes it perfectly clear that the changes ordered by him were urgently demanded by the good of the public service, and incidentally brings out the fact that the great reformer, Silas W. Burt, has been guilty of something very like "pernicious activity" in using his political influence to push the fortunes of his brother as a favored sugar broker. Mr. Fairchild's letter reveals a condition of affairs in the custom house that suggests the need of still further reform, unless it be accounted useless to attempt to reform an institution that promotes perjury and engages in a business that appears to be closely akin to systematic robbery.

The university of Cambridge in England has conferred the degree of doctor of laws on, among others, Prince Albert Victor and Mr. A. J. Balfour. The reason for the distinction in the case of Albert Victor is clear enough—he is the son of the prince of Wales, which includes everything. But what has Mr. Balfour done that three letters should be added to his name?

TO FIND EACH OTHER.

A Suggestion That the Addresses of Single Tax Men be Published.

F. W. Rockwell of Farmington, Iowa, writes as follows:

When in Chicago last fall I rode in the street cars a whole day trying to find some of the single tax advocates whose names I had seen in THE STANDARD, but could find none of them. I therefore suggest that the name and street address of one prominent advocate of the true doctrine in each of the large cities of the United States be kept standing in THE STANDARD. One line of agate would be sufficient for each. But the addresses of such men as Mr. Bailey, Martin Williams, Ring of Texas, etc., ought to be at hand in every copy of THE STANDARD. The fact that the street and number of a man appeared in one copy isn't sufficient, for who is able to keep a STANDARD, with the thousands on every side that need them? As soon think of keeping a board on the bank of a river full of drowning men. If I get to read one before I give it away, I think I'm lucky. F. W. ROCKWELL.

THE STANDARD will be willing to print such addresses if our friends will send them in. We could, of course, get up a large list without this, but possibly there may be cases in which our friends would not care to have their names published. When there is an organization, the address should be that of the secretary.

I. Binnerhassett, box 276, Little Rock, Arkansas, would be glad to get the names and address of single tax men in that section of the country.

Seneca Falls Men Solid.

SENECA FALLS, N. Y.—The 109 men here who voted the united labor ticket last fall are all single tax men and nearly all free traders. They believe the democrats are fighting their battle far more effectually than they could themselves. When the democrats stop, it will be time enough for the single tax men to take up the fight. The platform made by Cleveland last December is the one which is receiving the attention of the people to-day.

We propose to help the free traders all we can in this fight, and are holding up the hands of the weak kneed ones.

I believe that the best posted men to-day in our town on the question of protection fallacies and free trade facts are the men who labored last fall for our ticket. When you find a knot of men discussing the great question on the street or in the store or shop, you will find the principal speaker is a single tax man. R. S. GANOUNG.

"One of the Surest Ways of Abolishing Poverty."

New York Mail and Express.

A beautiful feminine deed is that of Miss Mary Norsworthy Shepard, who gives a drinking fountain to the city, on Park avenue. Baroness Burdett-Coutts-Bartlett has immortalized herself in perpetuating the memory of a faithful dog in Edinburgh by a watery monument of this beneficent kind; Brussels rejoices in the blackest kind of a negro baby boy, which dispenses from his bronze form the life giving fluid; Miss Olivia Stokes has consecrated Madison square, and D. Willis James, Union square, to the charity of ministering to Christ in the persons of the thirsty. Now Miss Shepard joins the band of the King's children.

This is one of the surest ways of abolishing poverty.

Brains vs. Pauper Labor.

London Engineering Journal.

We published last week a letter from a correspondent drawing attention to American competition in the production of gold extracting machinery for South Africa. The American batteries at work are said to do two and a half times the work of English ones of equal size, and if English manufacturers have thus allowed themselves to be outstripped in improvements, it will not be surprising if orders for machinery be sent to the United States instead of to this country. At the same time rivalry in another form is likely to tell upon English trade. The impending development of a net work of railways in South Africa has attracted thither American agents, who are preparing to compete with English firms for the supply of rails and rolling stock.

TRANS-ATLANTIC NOTES.

OBSERVATIONS OF A TOURIST IN HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

American Trade With Holland—Why American Copper is Sold for Less in Europe than in the United States—Taking Coals to Newcastle—Protection in Belgium.

BRUSSELS, June 1.—Permit me to put before the readers of THE STANDARD a few facts relative to the question of free trade or protection that have lately come within my notice. In the last week of April the steamship P. Caland of the Northerlands line arrived in the port of New York with a cargo of iron, mainly in the form of bars and wire, and having also on board 700 immigrants. When she sailed from New York the next week she carried to Holland, the land of cattle, a cargo made up mostly of meats, lard and oleomargarine. She had also in her hold 300 tons of copper. The P. Caland is, of course, not an American vesssel.

If it is the purpose of the tariff to preserve the home market for American manufacturers, it is evident from the importation of iron by the P. Caland that for some reason that object is not fully successful in this one important respect. The American consumer is buying iron abroad, and he can afford to pay, not only the market price for it in Europe, but also the cost of transportation to America and a duty of one-third or more for various forms of the metal. With the richest of mines, and furnaces and manufactories sufficient to turn out in six months product enough for a year's consumption, American iron producers are not holding control of the home market. Again, if the purpose of the tariff is to protect American industry, the human freight carried by the P. Calaud illustrates the utter failure of the protection which keeps up the prices of commodities, but admits freely to the country labor that must compete with the labor already there for an opportunity to produce those commodities.

The copper carried to Holland by the P. Caland is sold in Europe at a price less than copper is sold for in the United States. The American market for copper is subject to monopoly by means of the tariff. Instead of permitting an over production of the metal to reduce prices, the comparatively few copper producers of the country export their surplus stock at figures that are remunerative, and sell in the home market at higher figures, which they are enabled to establish without fear of foreign competition. It is in this way that the American consumer is encouraging home industry in copper production. He pays the producers a premium which foreign consumers need not pay. He is the poorer for the system; the monopolists of the industry are the richer; the wage worker is none the better off, his wages being fixed, not by the wealth of the monopolist, but by the general competition of wage workers seeking employment. The country loses by the unjust system, through the robbery of the consumer, through the loss of international trade, and through putting into the hands of foreigners what trade there is.

If there were no duty on copper, the mines of the United States would be worked at least to the extent to which they are now. The assertion needs no further proof than the fact that American copper is profitably exported to the markets of the world. There would be at least as many workmen employed in producing raw copper in America as at present, and their wages, instead of, as some of them fear, being reduced by the abolition of the tariff, might be increased by a demand for more American copper. That there would be such a demand no one can doubt who considers the vast consumption of copper in the factories of Connecticut, from which finished products would be shipped to Europe were the price of copper in America brought down to the level of American copper in Europe. That there would be also an increased demand for operators in copper and brass goods factories is beyond question. And, further, there would be greater activity in America's foreign trade.

The P. Caland is owned in a country which has none of the metals used in the construction of ships, little of the wood for hulls, and none of the cotton for sails. But in proportion to its population, that country has perhaps the largest mercantile marine in the world. It buys in the cheapest markets, whether of raw materials or of finished products, the only exception being in a small list of luxuries. When a ship is built at the great shipyards of Rotterdam, its cost is the bare cost of material added to that for labor. No premium is paid to any class or industry whatever to assist it to keep alive. If such a premium is put on the goods of any country, Rotterdam goes elsewhere to buy. She buys no American goods on which there is such a premium. The copper she takes is with the premium off. Put American shipwrights in the same circumstances as those of Rotterdam—that is to say, of freedom—and who can doubt that American ingenuity would win in the race for the world's custom in ship buying. Travel in American ships would doubtless would be as much preferable to that in the ships of other nations as the pleasure of travel in American railway cars is now to the discomforts in European railway "wagons." Behind the tariff wall in America there is imprisoned a spirit of enterprise which needs but to be set free in order to conquer the commercial world. Trade knows no country. Permit the American, with his keen eye for business, to go out into the world with his goods, his machines, and his materials, and he will enrich himself and help advance mankind. But somehow he has at present a poor opinion of himself. He believes a pauper can beat him as workman and dealer.

It is rather remarkable that the P. Caland carried to Holland a large amount of products nearly resembling those of that country, namely, meat and lard. It was like carrying coals to Newcastle, it would seem. It can be explained by the fact that only the best grades of beef are raised in Holland, the price of land in that country not permitting the production of those of poorer quality. The American meat producer needs no protection, and gets none. Although he is paying a higher price for labor than is paid anywhere else in the world, his products are underselling those of the old world in the European markets. He is free to sell, but is not free to buy. The free government of the United States dictates to him that he must make his own living and assist his neighbor to make one also by buying of him at a big price what he might buy cheaply if he were at liberty to buy wherever he would.

I had lately an interesting interview with a manufacturer of protected Belgian beer, and another with a manufacturer of free trade Holland gin. There is a heavy customs duty on beer in Belgium, and also a heavy internal revenue tax. The duty is for the purpose of preventing the importation of foreign beers; the tax is for revenue. Home brewers possess nearly the whole market; there are but a few of them, and they are well satified. Lately, an additional tax was laid upon beer, and the consequent action of the brewers was merely a repetition of what they had done previously each time that the tax had been increased. They raised the price to retailers, who in turn put on a slight increase to the public. The additional amount taken by the brewers was enough to pay the tax and considerable more. The public growled, but then there must be taxation, and beer is a luxury. There are no new brewers appearing in the Belgian markets, attracted by the high price of beer, for, in the first place, modern processes in brewing require a very large capital, and, in the second, the ruinous competition that would be set up against a beginner by the established brewers is well known. The brewer to whom I have referred, buys his grains in America. He needed no enlightenment on the subject of the fallacy of protection in his business. He frankly said it was a good thing—for him. If the public did not take better care of its business it was through no fault of his.

The gin maker was from Schiedam, where there are nearly three hundred distilleries. He began by saying we were wise in America in keeping our market for ourselves. Business at Schiedam was not prosperous, as Schiedam gin could not enter many foreign countries owing to a tariff duty on it. Since they could not have the markets of those countries he would like to see Holland adopt the policy of protection in that article of production. In that case the gin distillers would have Holland's custom, at all events. It would foster a home industry. Work would be made for the poor. A business now languishing would thrive. As the talk went on, however, the gin maker admitted that he bought his wheat in America, his barley in Russia, and other materials in France. The sole advantage given to Holland through keeping up his business for him would be in giving employment to the workingmen. In response to a question he said he employed some Germans. He then said, as if admitting a fact that all men would concede, that universal free trade would be best for every country. The most competent men would have the best chance everywhere then, he thought. As for protecting labor, the laborer now found his way from any part of the world to any country promising him, for any reason, better conditions. J. W. SULLIVAN.

IN NEW ENGLAND.

The Conditions of Labor and the Awakening of Free Trade Thought.

BOSTON, June 25.—In the Newmarket, N. H., *Advertiser* recently appeared this paragraph:

There seems to be a regular exodus of our best people this spring. In fact, is has been so, more or less, for several years, and unless some industry is started here to employ the better class, it is only a question of time when there will be few except French Canadians in town. The capitalists should "wake up" and start some industry, for their own benefit as well as that of others, as real estate and buildings must depreciate in value unless we have something here besides cotton mills.

This aptly describes the condition of industry in Newmarket. The town has for its principal industry the manufacture of cotton cloth, a commodity upon which a protective duty is maintained with the pretension of keeping out of our markets similar products of foreign labor, thereby reserving American markets for American manufacturers and American employment for American workmen. Protection has partially succeeded in securing these markets for American products by restricting imports; but what has it done against the importation of foreign laborers?

What are the markets worth to our merchants if they are compelled to collect import duties on nearly every article of necessity produced in a foreign country, and increased charges that domestic manufacturers are enabled to impose by the removal of foreign competition? Increase in prices brings decrease in trade.

In Newmarket the best people (the best buyers) are leaving the town, being crowded out by a people who do not buy half as much. The "better class" who, in this instance, are working people, live better and give their children better education than do those who take their places. The native working people try to support their children and keep them at school until they are old enough to go to work. The new comers have somewhat different and fewer requirements and aspirations. Their women must work as hard as the men, and children must work, too.

Massachusetts is undergoing a similar process. During the recent session of the legislature the committee on child labor gave a hearing on a bill to compel the attendance at school for a certain number of weeks of children employed in factories. The following argument was made by a representative of Massachusetts manufacturers:

J. L. Sargent urged as an objection to the bill that great hardship would be done in many poor families by being needlessly strict. Massachusetts could not afford to do this. It would deter many industrious families from coming there. As a representative of manufacturers he opposed such restrictions. Many industrious families who came there, he said, are obliged to depend for a time on the earnings of their children, who, though unable to read and write English correctly, are proficient in the use of their native tongue. This bill would prevent their working until they have attended the schools of Massachusetts for forty weeks. He further said that the industries of Massachusetts were hard pushed by similar industries in other parts of the country, and that these people were needed. He said he had special reference to the French Canadians.

So the manufacturers need these people from a foreign country! But there is no scarcity of laborers in Massachussetts. The report of the bureau of labor statistics shows a large number of unemployed. Can it be that these manufacturers, who are so willing to spend their time and money in lobbying for the continuance of the protective tariff, "to keep up the wages of American workingmen," are looking for laborers who will work for less wages? No; dismiss the thought! It is unworthy of workingmen who would obediently accept their protecting employers' opinion as their own. I remember reading of a "sweet girl graduate" who chose as the subject of her essay, "They who think should govern those who toil." Toilers, don't bother yourselves with thinking. It may make you discontented. It is out of your line. Leave it to the properly authorized and designated persons.

The workingmen of the First congressional district in New Hampshire defeated the republican protectionist candidate for congress at the last election, and elected the nominee of the democratic and labor parties. Rev. L. F. McKinney, who, however, is trying to be a protectionist-tariff reformer, is endeavoring to satisfy all of his constituents at once. Thus not much has been accomplished, but it is sufficient to give promise of better things.

Considering the growing dissatisfaction of workingmen with the results of protection, and their willingness to listen to free trade doctrines, their representative may be brought to the necessity of changing his tune or stepping aside for somebody who will.

Similar awakening of thought is to be seen in many places in New England.

FRANK E. STACKPOLE.

SOCIETY NOTES.

Midsummer dreariness seemed to settle on the city last week. That part of town where people live looked as if the eighty or a hundred thousand people who flee to the country every year had all gone and left the million and more of their neighbors to their melting fate. This million or so was principally engaged in keeping cool, but not with much success. From the rural suburban districts, from the mountains and the sea shore, come rumors of the gay times which the fashionable people of leisure are having in their secluded cool retreats. These exasperating tales were brought to town by fond friends who came into the city on one or two days to attend belated June weddings, or to watch the yacht regattas. Many gay parties were at sea on those days. There was a gathering, too, of more than usual interest at Lenox, when the new Episcopal church was consecrated.—[New York Tribune.

Of all the plague spots in North America at the present time the most appalling one is the Italian tenement house district in the crooked part of Mulberry street, which lies between Park and Bayard streets. It stands to-day as a menace to the whole city—a festering, foul, overcrowded breeder of fevers and stenches. From one end to the other this frightful neighborhood is alive with vermin. In its dark dens are packed in almost inconceivable squalor the most filthy human beings. Its breath is disease, its touch pollution.—[New York Herald.

The Rev. I. Newton Stanger, the rector of the Episcopal church of the Holy Trinity, Harlem, will take a vacation of six weeks, beginning on the last of July. "I go," he says, "into the North woods, where there is more real pleasure for the thoughtful, nature loving man, and more robust strength to be found, more deer to be shot and more trout to be caught by the true sportsman than in any place I know of. I always go in tired and jaded and come out robust and strong."—[New York Tribune.

The Rev. Dr. D. Parker Morgan, rector of the Church of the Heavenly Rest, Fifth avenue, near Forty-fifth street, says: "By the kindness of the vestry, I am given this year a three months' vacation. I sail, D. V., by the Gallia, on July 4, and shall spend the months of July, August and September in England and Wales. I hope to be in my pulpit again on the first Sunday in October."—[New York Tribune.

Crowds of the dirty occupants of the filthy rookeries in Mulberry bend thronged the rough pavements of the foul smelling street and curiously gazed upon the visitors who in twos and threes went into the buildings and ascended to the roofs. Never was the Italian quarter more full of human wretchedness. The foul air was sickening, and the sight—take one example—of thirty people in a single room in which no light could fall even on a sunny day was appalling.—[New York Herald.

On June 1 the fifth season began at the Crescent Valley house, Pawlet, Vt., of which favorable report is often heard. Nestled in the famous Green mountains, it is a much to be coveted hotel by those who would feast their eyes on "royal scenery" and fill their lungs with purest and most health giving mountain air.—[New York Mail and Express.

Fortunately for human beings and brute animals Sunday was a day of rest, or the fatality list would probably have exceeded that of Saturday. Notwithstanding the advantage gained from a general rest, there were several deaths caused by the heat, and many indirectly. There was something of a breeze for a time, but when it failed the air seemed to have been blown across a furnace. The heat radiated from the sunburned paving blocks as from an overheated oven. Those who were compelled to remain in the city suffered intensely. In the poorer districts houses were almost deserted for the shady side of the streets, where people sat and sometimes stretched themselves.—[New York World.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Collyer, pastor of the Church of the Messiah, says: "The church will be closed from Tuesday, June 24, until the third Sunday in September, and we shall spend the vacation at Spring Lake, N. J., in our own hired house. But in August I shall 'lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help,' up New Hampshire way, and do a bit of preaching Sundays where I happen to alight, if all is well. We do not 'supply' our pulpit in vacation because there is no congregation. People seem to be as glad to take a rest from hearing as we are to take one from preaching; and I don't blame them."—[New York Tribune.

There were 811 deaths in the city last week, against 680 the week before. Of these 287 were of infants less than a year old and 389 were of children under five years of age. The increase, clearly due to the heat, was mainly in tenement houses, or 532 against 433 the previous week.

The Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby, pastor of the Fourth avenue Presbyterian church, will, as usual, spend his vacation, July and August, at his cottage near Pine hill, in the Catskills. During his absence his church will be closed.

The Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Virgin, pastor of the Pilgrim Congregational church, says: "I shall leave the city the last week in June to be absent during July and August. Our farm at West Chelmsford, Massachusetts, is the all-attractive spot for me and my family, and I expect to spend all my time there in the fields and woods with the chickens and calves, and with old 'Billy' on the road."

After a recent tenement house fire the New York *World* interviewed some of the people who had lost their entire household effects. Among them was Louis Dieter, a delicate young man with a wife and two children. They occupy now one room at No. 1 East Second street. The report reads: "Sitting disconsolately with her two little children Mrs. Dieter yesterday told the story of her woe. Her husband, who is twenty-four years old, is a driver, and now has a position where he earns $7 a week, and on this sum he must needs support his wife and children. They managed to live while they had some little furniture, but now they have none and the problem staring them in the face is how long it will take to save enough to purchase furniture after paying for the food they must have. The heat was intense in the stuffy room yesterday, and the children were sick and peevish, and the poor mother had additional cares to keep them around. Without a home or the money demanded by the landlord in advance to secure one, without a stick of furniture, not even a bed to sleep on; without a stitch of clothing, except borrowed articles, to put on their backs, their case is indeed one to attract sympathy."

Five thousand dollars for underwear is not an unheard of item in the outfit of a fashionable bride. The girl of the period who wants a chic outfit from top to toe will begin with the knitted silk vests tied up with ribbons. The chemise which the fashionable woman favors just now is made of China silk, hand woven, in any soft, light shade. With set of silk underwear, two silk skirts, silk corset cover, satin corset, silk stockings, etc., a fashionable woman may stand up nowadays inside of not much less than $200 before she thinks of putting on her gown.

The husband and two children of Sarah Jane Whiteling of Philadelphia died under suspicious circumstances a short time ago. The physicians gave certificates of death from inflammation of the bowels and gastric fever. When the bodies were exhumed, however, by order of the coroner, an autopsy proved that there had been arsenical poisoning in each case. Mrs. Whiteling admitted having poisoned the children, but said her husband had committed suicide. "John had been sick a month before he died," she said, "and as his health was poor, and he had frequently lost good positions by reason of his illness, he had become despondent and took his life." Then, she says, she killed the nine-year-old girl because she was afraid she would grow up in sin and crime, and the boy she killed "because he was in the way."

Marching Song.

E. Rabitt.

If you dam up the river of progress
At your peril and cost let it be!
That river must seaward, despite you
'Twill break down your dams and be free!
And we heed not the pitiful barriers
That you in its way have downcast,
For your efforts but add to the torrent
Whose flood must o'erwhelm you at last!
For our banner is raised and unfurled,
At your head our defiance is hurled;
Our hope is the hope of the ages,
Our cause is the cause of the world!

We laugh in the face of the forces
That strengthen the flood they oppose;
For the harder oppression the fiercer
The current will be when it flows.
We shall win, and the tyrants' battalions
Will be scattered like chaff in the fight,
From which the true soldiers of freedom
Shall gather new courage and might!
For our banner is raised and unfurled,
At your head our defiance is hurled;
Our hope is the hope of the ages,
Our cause is the cause of the world!

Whether leading the van of the fighters
In the bitterest stress of the strife,
Or patiently bearing the burden
Of changelessly common place life,
One hope we have ever before us,
One aim to attain and fulfill,
One watchword we cherish to mark us
One kindred and brotherhood still!
For our banner is raised and unfurled,
At your head our defiance is hurled;
Our hope is the hope of the ages,
Our cause is the cause of the world!

What matter if failure on failure
Crowd closely upon us and press!
When a hundred have bravely been beaten,
The hundred and first wins success!
Our watchword is "Freedom," new soldiers
Flock each day where her flag is unfurled,
Our hope is the hope of the ages,
Our cause is the cause of the world!
For our banner is raised and unfurled,
At your head our defiance is hurled;
Our hope is the hope of the ages.
Our cause is the cause of the world!

THE PARSON'S WIFE'S DREAM.

The very moment I caught sight of the parson's wife coming up the walk I knew she was full of something. There was that hurriedness in her gait, that beaming look in her eyes, that expression about her lips, as though she were having a desperately hard struggle to keep from saying something, which in this particular parson's wife are the unfailing signs of a full heart that must find relief in talking. She didn't stop to shut the gate, but left it to swing to, or stay open, as it pleased. When I saw that I knew I was in for it. "Get a pitcher of cool water," I said to Katie, and braced myself for the shock.

The parson's wife tripped up the veranda steps, and dropped into a steamer chair. "Oh! John," she panted, "it's a grand success. Let me have a glass of water."

Little Katie appeared with the pitcher and a glass, and the parson's wife refreshed herself. "Thank you, dear," she murmured, and then dashed at me again.

"I've just left the rooms, and rushed over here to tell you all about it. We've cleaned out nearly everything, and at good prices, too. Mrs. Nelson's bread and cakes were a great success, and we could have sold twice as much of Sallie Wilson's candy if she'd sent it in. And only think, Mrs. Everard Brown was there, and I showed her some of Evelyn Fitch's needlework, and she's going to give Evelyn an order for twenty dollars' worth of underwear. Isn't it glorious? And oh! you know Jemima Johnson, and what a hard time she has with that good for nothing father of hers! Well, Jemima was crying yesterday because she had nothing to send in, and she *did* want to take advantage of it so badly. So I suggested that she should cut some of her flowers and send them. And so she sent about a bushel of roses and dahlias, and all sorts of things. My heart just sank when I saw them, for I thought we never *could* get rid of so many. But, do you know, we sold them, every one, and got orders for more. They fetched three dollars and twenty cents, and when I gave Jemima the money she just broke down and cried, and then it all came out, that since she lost her work for that wretched New York factory they've been living on dry bread —only think of it—and Jemima was too proud to let anybody know. I just had to cry, too. But oh! John, isn't it delightful that we've found a way to do something to relieve *some* of the distress?" And here the parson's wife, whose supremest joy in life it is to be doing something to help other people, fairly broke down for a minute, and put her handkerchief to her eyes.

"I can't help it," she said, drying her tears. "When I think of poor Jemima, it seems as though I had to cry. But now, John, you *are* glad we are doing so well, aren't you? And you'll do what you can to help us, won't you?"

"For pity's sake, Esther"—I must explain that the parson's wife is a sister of mine, and her name is Esther—"for pity's sake, Esther, begin at the beginning, and tell me what you're talking about?"

"Why," said the parson's wife, "it's our Women's Exchange."

Of course there was no use for me to ask the question, for the parson's wife had talked of nothing else but the Women's Exchange for the last six weeks, and I knew perfectly well she couldn't be talking of anything else now. But when this lady gets into one of her enthusiastic fits I consider it judicious to throw a little cold water on her in the shape of some innocent question or remark. If I didn't I should stand a chance of being carried away by the flood of her enthusiasm.

"And you do think it's a good thing, don't you, John?" persisted the parson's wife.

Yes, I did think it a good thing. It is always a good thing to relieve distress without the actual bestowal of alms—good for the person relieved, and good, too, for the reliever. I felt that the parson's wife deserved credit for what she had done, and I told her so. She had labored faithfully and successfully to solve a pretty difficult problem—the problem of bringing together the rich who are eager to assist the poor and the poor whose honest pride makes them shrink from accepting aid. The parson's wife could easily have gone to Mrs. Everard Brown and got twenty dollars from her to be bestowed on Evelyn Fitch; and there are several other wealthy people in the neighborhood who would have been delighted to subscribe for the relief of poor Jemima Johnson. They are neither selfish nor greedy, these rich folks who have their summer residences near our village of Pleasant Hills. They are only too glad when they can persuade the parson's wife to act as stewardess of their bounty—and this, not because they are averse to doing their good deeds in person, but because they know by sad experience that to let their charitable dispositions be known would be to make Pleasant Hills a focus and rallying point of pauperism. But the parson's wife—and I honor her for it—will have as little to do as possible with alms giving. She says it is a cruelty to the poor. The idea of giving *money* to Miss Fitch or Miss Johnson is shocking to her. And, besides, as she says with pride in her protegees, those young ladies wouldn't take it. So I honestly admired Mrs. Esther for the good work she had been doing, and I told her so unhesitatingly.

And yet I suppose there must have been a tone in my voice that qualified my verdict of approval; or, deep down in the little woman's honest, loving heart, there may have been a doubt whether her success was all that she would like to have it; for the parson's wife ceased smiling, and she repeated her question as though she doubted what the answer might be.

"It really *is* a good thing, John?"

"It really is a good thing. You've helped people to help themselves. Isn't that good enough for you?"

"But I mean good all the way through. It's a good thing right down to the bottom, isn't it?"

Now deuce take the woman, what did she want to ask me that for? Couldn't she be satisfied to go away with such meed of approval as I could honestly give her, and not come digging into my mind with questions about things being good all the way through and down to the bottom? But there, the question was asked, and the parson's wife was waiting, And she is that sort of a body that when she asks a question, she means to have an answer. I said:

"What would Mrs. Everard Brown have done if she hadn't ordered that twenty dollars' worth of underwear from Miss Fitch?"

"Why, I suppose she'd have gone somewhere else and bought it."

"And the folks who bought Mrs. Nelson's bread and cakes, and Sallie Wilson's candy —would they have bought elsewhere if they hadn't patronized your Exchange?"

"I suppose they would," said the parson's wife. Her face was getting troubled now.

"My dear Esther," said I, "don't you see that what you've done has been simply to take work away from some people to give it to others? You tell me about poor Jemima Johnson's distress since she lost her work for that factory that paid her so little for her sewing. How do you know but that the very reason she lost it may be because some other good-hearted Mrs. Brown may have relieved some other Evelyn Fitch by giving her work to do and so lessening the call for Jemima Johnson's needle? Won't the stores in Pleasant Hills, and even in New York sell fewer goods now that your Exchange is started? And won't somebody get less wages on that account? You've lessened the distress in your own neighborhood. Let that content you, dear, and try not to think of the distress you are not forced to see."

The trouble deepened in her face, and she sat for five minutes or more in thought. Then her countenance cleared, as though she'd got the clue and saw her way out of the difficulty.

"What you say isn't true down to the bottom, John. Suppose that Mrs. Nelson, who never buys any candy from anybody now, sells her bread and cake and buys Sallie Wilson's candy, and Evelyn Fitch, who can't afford cake now, buys Mrs. Wilson's cake with the money from her needlework: and Minnie Johnson sells her flowers and buys Evelyn's needlework, and Sallie Wilson spends the money for her candy in flowers—eh? Who'd be out of pocket then? It seems to me that there'd be four women enjoying cake, and candy, and needlework, and flowers who otherwise wouldn't have any at all, and so they *couldn't* be hurting anybody else by buying from each other. What do you say to that, Mr. John?"

It was beautiful to see the parson's wife's enthusiasm. It almost swept me off my feet. "By Jove!" I said, "you'll build a city with your Women's Exchange before you get through, and everybody in it will be rich! You'll have some folks sending in vegetables, and others meats, and other jellies and preserves; and some will bring clothes, and some do cooking, and some keep bees and bring along the honey, and some raise silk worms, and—why not?—some weave the silk. Every industry in the country will be represented in your exchange. And the more everybody brings in, the more they can take out. Talk about poverty—why you won't know the meaning of the word!"

The parson's wife was in raptures. Her eyes danced; her cheeks were flushed, her lips were wreathed in smiles. Her whole soul was in her face.

"Oh, John!" she said at last," it seems too good to be true! And yet I can see how it would all come about. Everybody'd be at work for everybody else; and everybody'd be doing just the thing that she could do best. And they wouldn't have to waste any time hunting for work. Because, of course, everybody would want things, and be making other things to pay for them with. Oh John! you *are* a darling!"

"Yes," I said, "you'll make Pleasant Hills such a delightful place to live in that everybody will want to move here."

"I know," said the parson's wife, "I can see all the possibilities. And I shan't lose any time, I promise you. I'll explain the thing to everybody in the village.

"Well," I said, "I think if I were you I'd see Deacon Brown and Squire Hildreth first. You know they own the biggest part of Pleasant Hills."

"Oh!" said the parson's wife, "they'll be sure to like the idea. Because the more people move here, and the better off they are, the more—"

The parson's wife stopped short. She looked dazed for a single instant, as though some tremendous fact had struck her like a sledge hammer. Then she burst into tears.

JOHN JONES.

HORACE GREELEY.

SOME PREGNANT WORDS OF HIS.

He Saw Clearly the Equal Rights of Man to the Soil but did not See How to Secure Them.

It would be easy to gather a "cloud of witnesses" to the truth of the fundamental propositions of the single tax movement from the best and most reputable writers. I suggest this to those who have time and opportunity, and in the meantime send you some extracts I have copied from the essays by Horace Greeley—"Land Reform" and "The Right to Labor." They were published in 1850 in a book entitled "Hints Toward Reform," which is dedicated "To the generous, the hopeful, the loving, who firmly and joyfully believing in the impartial and boundless goodness of our Father, trust that the errors, the crimes and the miseries which have long rendered earth a hell shall yet be swallowed up and forgotten in a far exceeding and unmeasured reign of truth, purity and bliss."

Here are the extracts:

The earth's surface undoubtedly contains good arable land enough to give every family in existence a farm of ample dimensions, even though all the unhealthful and inhospitable portions of the globe were left utterly uninhabited. But of the one thousand millions of human beings who are supposed to be in existence, what proportion practically enjoy the right to any soil except that with which their lifeless bodies are finally covered? What proportion are at liberty to obey God's command, "Six days shalt thou labor," save in the contingency that some one else knows that he can buy that labor and all its product on such terms that he may realize a pecuniary profit on the speculation?

Now these deductions can hardly seem far fetched: Man, having a conceded right to live, has a necessary right also to a reasonable share of their means of subsistence which God has provided for, and made virtually necessary to, the whole human family. Having a right to liberty, he must have consequently the right to go somewhere on earth and do what is essential to his continued existence, not by the purchased permission of some other man, but by virtue of his manhood. Having the right to procure his own happiness by any means not inconsistent with the welfare and happiness of others, he has the right to do so somewhere, and to be protected and justified in doing so. In short, the terrestrial man, possessing the well known properties of matter as well as of spirit, can only in truth enjoy the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" by being guaranteed some place in which to enjoy them. He who has no clear, inherent right to live somewhere, has no right to live at all.

But look at the question from the side of labor. God expressly commands men to labor six days of every seven, and has made obedience to this command a vital condition of healthful and comfortable existence. (Alas that one man should obey, and another enjoy the reward of his obedience!) There, in a state or county, are fifty thousand persons able and willing to labor, with an abundance of arable land to employ them all constantly and reward them generously. But the land mainly belongs to a few dozens or hundreds of this population, who virtually say to the twenty or thirty thousand would-be laborers who own no land, "You can only be allowed to work here on condition that you will allow us (in the shape of rents, price of land or depressed wages) one-half to three-fourths of the entire product of your toil." Is not here a heavy tax levied by man upon obedience to the laws of nature and God? Who does not see that labor is discouraged and idleness immensely increased by this exaction, and the power vested in this few to impose it?

Yet the most appalling feature of our present system of land holding is the manifest tendency of its evils to become more aggravated and intolerable—nay, the inevitable necessity that they should become so, if the system itself be endured. If the population of the British Isles were this day no more dense than that of Indiana or Russia, the average recompense of its labor would doubtless be increased and the condition of its laboring people greatly improved. The gradual increase of population therein from three or four millions to thirty or forty, has, in connection with the monopoly of the soil by a class who are not its cultivators, gradually carried up the market value and the yearly rental of arable land to prices which enable the land holding few to riot in unparalleled luxury, and doom the landless many to toil evermore for the barest necessaries of life, while hundreds of thousands vainly beg from door to door an opportunity to earn the blackest bread by the most repulsive and meagerly recompensed drudgery. Like causes will produce like effects here and elsewhere. It is not the fact that the landlords are few that is so baneful; if they were ten times as many, the evil would hardly be mitigated. So long as the millions whom God has doomed in the sweat of their face to eat bread shall be constrained to solicit of others the privilege of so doing, and to propitiate the land owning class by such a share of their products as cupidity may exact and necessity must concede, the increase of population will be paralleled by the depression of labor and laborer.

. . . . . .

A ready objection of those who have scarcely thought on the subject is that any attempt to remedy by law the irregularities of fortune in the matter of land involves the principle of an arbitrary distribution of property equally to everbody. But this is an egregious error. What nature indicates and justice requires is equal opportunities to all.

. . . . . .

The earth, the air, the waters, the sunshine, with their natural products, were divinely intended and appointed for the use and sustenance of man—not for a part only, but for the whole human family.

Civilized society, as it exists in our day, has divested the larger portion of mankind of the unimpeded, unpurchased enjoyment of their natural rights. That larger portion may be perishing with cold, yet have no legally recognized right to a stick of decaying fuel in the most unfrequented morass; or may be famishing, yet have no legal right to pluck and eat the bitterest acorn in the depths of the remotest wilderness. The denial or confiscation of man's natural right to use any portion of the earth's surface not actually in use by another, is an important fact, to be kept in view in every consideration of the duty of the affluent and comfortable to the poor and unfortunate.

. . . By a law of nature, every person born in the state of New York had a perfect right to be here, and to his equal share of the soil, the woods, the waters, and all the natural products thereof. But by the law of society, all but the possessors of title deeds exist here only by the purchased permission of the land owning class, and are intruders and trespassers on the soil of their nativity without that permission. By law, the landless have no inherent right to stand on a single square foot of the state of New York, except in the highways.

The only solid ground on which this surrender of the original property of the whole to a minor portion can be justified is that of public good—the good, not of a part, but of the whole. The people of a past generation, through their rulers, claimed and exercised the right of divesting, not themselves only, but the majority of all future generations of their original and inherent right to possess and cultivate any unimproved portion of the soil of our state for their own maintenance and benefit. To render this assumption of power valid to the fearful extent to which it was exercised, it is essential that it be demonstrated that the good of all was promoted by such exercise.

Is this rationally demonstrable now? Can the widow, whose children pine and shiver in some bleak, miserable garret, be made to realize that she and her babies are benefited by or in consequence of the granting to a part an exclusive right to use the earth and enjoy its fruits? Can the poor man who day after day paces the streets of a city in search of any employment at any price, be made to realize it on his part? These questions admit of but one answer. And one inevitable consequence of the prevailing system is, that as population increases and arts are perfected, the income of the wealthy owner of land increases while the recompense of the hired or leasehold cultivator is steadily diminishing. The labor of Great Britain is twice as effective now as it was a century ago, but the laborer is worse paid, fed and lodged than he then was, while the incomes of the landlord class have been enormously increased. . . .

What has been rightfully done by the authorized agents of the state or nation can only be retracted upon urgent public necessity and upon due ratification to all whose private rights are thereby invaded. But those who have been divested of an important, a vital natural right, are also entitled to compensation. The right to labor, secured to all in the creation of the earth, taken away in the granting of the soil to a minor portion of them, must be restored.

The chief evil of human society is clearly enough described in the foregoing quotations; the "monopoly of land" described as that source of all wrongs, which, while it exists, will make the grandest reforms almost useless. But when it comes to pointing out the remedy, Horace Greeley is no longer a competent guide. That every man is entitled to an equal share in the soil of his native land, he clearly sees; but how to secure that right he does not see. When he speaks of a remedy, he is hopelessly vague, and to follow him becomes impossible. The only remedy he can see is the equal division of the soil among the whole people! No man should be allowed to hold more than he can himself use, and no more than others. But where should the limit be drawn? How large a piece should a man be allowed to take? Greeley himself does not venture to suggest a limit. And of the division of the soil of cities, or of woods and mines, he says nothing.

But how would men like Horace Greeley, who, feeling the hopelessness of their own remedies, have rejoiced, had they lived to witness the discovery of the true remedy—the land value tax; had they been able to see the possibility of securing to all their natural rights to the soil; to give every one an equal share therein, without changing the present system of using the land?

Horace Greeley says well that it is not the number of landlords that causes the evils of the present system of land holding, but the existence of any landlords. And yet the only remedy he can propose is to divide the soil of the country between the people! Even though that would prove an effectual remedy in this and the next generation, another Horace Greeley could, in another half century, repeat the words above quoted against the then owners of the soil. There would then again be a class of "landless" people depending on the tender mercies of the land owners whom Horace Greeley's remedy would have created. He shows plainly that it is private ownership of land that is the curse of our civilization (and not the number of private owners), and yet his only remedy is an increase in the number of private owners! He gives it as the most sacred and the fundamental human right that every man, woman, and child shall have an equal share in the soil of their native land, and yet the remedy he proposes would be very far from securing that!

And though his remedy could accomplish so little, yet how revolutionary and impractical it is! Think of the difficulties of any such division! Think of the cities, the mines, and the woods.

But it was the best that men could propose thirty years ago. So deeply did they feel the wrong that they were willing to try even such a remedy!

The remedy we propose is no artificial system or theory, simply obedience to nature's laws; no impossible division of the soil, simply giving to all what belongs to all; the rent that belongs to all as landlords, and to each the fruits of his labor and the perfect freedom to labor how, where and when he pleases, and to dispose of his property as he likes, so long as he does not encroach upon the natural rights of his fellow men.

We do not propose to divide the soil of the land in squares and set a family on each square. If one man wants a square mile he may have it; if another wishes only ten acres he may have it; if one would sell his farm there would be nothing to hinder; if another would rather start a newspaper than work a farm he could do so without losing his equal interest in the soil of his land. All we propose is to give to all what Horace Greeley says belongs to all, the land of the country, by giving the nation the natural rent, that is that value arising from land which cannot be ascribed to improvements upon it. We propose to secure the right of every man to the fruits of his own labor, and the free use of such land as he may desire, for which he may pay the value in the form of a tax, and which he obtains improved or after buying the accompanying improvements.

And those who object to the land tax seem to forget that we pay it already in the form of rent to land owners. All that is now proposed is to appropriate this rent for the state, whose real earning it is, and to abolish all other taxes.

We pay two taxes at present, one to the state and another to the owners of the earth. We propose to reduce taxation by one-half.

Ground rent is not created by landlords, but only reaped by them. It is a natural growth which cannot be abolished as long as two men desire the same piece of land; it is but a question as to who shall have it, a few individuals, or the the whole community; owing to the ignorance of the people a few individuals are permitted to appropriate it. Private ownership in land means simply private right to values which result from the labor and growth of the community. These values should be used to defray common expenses.

And thus all can be secured in their rights in the soil, and at the same time all taxes on industry can be abolished. The tax thus levied is no tax on private property, trade or labor, but falls simply on the earnings of the whole people. It is not a private contribution to the support of the government, but the independent income of society. The whole people becomes the one landlord, but without right or power to levy any rent in excess of the ground value, and without right or power in any way to interfere with the free use and transfer of land, so long as the tax is paid and the rights of society are not violated. Speculators would be forced to use their land or give it up. There would be a great lightening of economic burdens throughout the land, and instead of living as now, anxious for the morrow, the whole people would at once feel contentment and ease.

"Aid the dawning, tongue and pen!
Aid it, hopes of honest men!
Aid it, paper! aid it, type!
Aid it, for the hour is ripe
And our earnest must not slacken into play!
Men of thought, and men of action, clear the way!"

H. TAMBS LYCHE.

Single Tax Men in Dayton.

The Henry George club of Dayton, Ohio, are holding meetings at Treon block every Sunday.

A LETTER FROM A CONVICT.

His Eyes Have Turned Toward the Light and He Hopes Yet to Say That the World's a Little Better for His Having Been in It.

——— PRISON, June 17.—I have dared to write this, although running a risk of being found out and punished. I write behind heavy iron bars that partially obscure the light and make writing difficult. I am not writing merely for my own pleasure, which is great indeed, but more for the sake of informing you of how new hopes have risen within the breasts of some of the criminals in this prison.

My name is ———, and I am serving out a term for assault. My time is nearly out.

Last October a fellow prisoner asked me if I would like to read THE STANDARD; and as anything is welcome to pass a lonely hour away, I said yes. I read it. It told me of things I never knew before. I became anxious to learn more, and every week since the THE STANDARD has been loaned to me, and I have studied it hard. I have also read "Progress and Poverty," "Protection or Free Trade" and "The Land Question." I do not presume to understand them as well as I should like, but I am determined to master them before I cry "go."

What I say of myself, I can also say for four others with whom I am acquainted. Among ourselves we have discussions, but as we cannot improve in verbal argument without opponents, we find it necessary for one of us to take an opposing stand. It fell to my lot to be that opponent. It is laughable to hear me trying to argue against self conviction.

We are sworn friends and have made up our minds to work hand in hand for the good cause, and although we are still outcasts from society, by God's help we shall be yet able to say that the world shall be a little better for our having been in it.

Our hopes are great indeed, and I assure you that more than one convict's prayer daily ascends heavenward for the success of this great movement.

Seven-tenths of the criminals with whom I have conversed are thieves, and of them all I have not found one who acknowledged that he had enough before he stole from others. They were all poor thieves, and such men are punished on the average more severely than any other class of criminals.

But there are greater thieves than the man who steals when he cannot provide for himself otherwise. These big thieves are those who make the laws or who cause laws to be made to suit them. They know that by making and enforcing laws that make them absolute owners of the land, in time they will become the owners of all things thereon—human flesh and blood as well. The big thieves must be got rid of before we can get rid of the small ones. Men cry shame on the petty thief and cast him out of the lap of society; but the man who steals the earth is permitted to run loose.

There are as manly and as noble hearts among the outcast as among any other class of men, if the cold, grabbing selfishness of the powerful would only give them a chance to show it.

———

In South Carolina.

CHARLESTON, S. C.—I was one of those who wanted an independent ticket; but your telling arguments converted me some time ago to the duty of the hour for all real single tax men. We must support those who are going our way.

I have resigned from the united labor party. In national politics there is at this time no room for a third party, and in South Carolina the fear of negro domination is such a powerful party lash that the local tax methods can be reformed more easily without an independent party.

In a quiet way single tax ideas are making a good deal of headway here. Some of our merchants are fighting against the license system, and the discussion is developing several facts as to the undesirability of punishing men for being industrious. A million dollar hotel is to be built by popular subscription, and an effort is being made to exempt it from taxation for ten years, on the plea of general benefits to the city. Query: If exempting one hotel will help the city, why not exempt not only hotels, but factories, stores, theaters? The consequent rise of land values would be an excellent source of taxation, relieving all industry from its present burdens.

Keep up the good work. We will follow THE STANDARD to ultimate victory.

BENJ. ADAMS.

Female Labor in Peoria.

PEORIA, Ill., June 19.—The following from one of our daily papers is suggestive:

Five years ago there was no industry in Peoria that employed girls. But within the last year or two there has been a great change. Female help now is scarce. We are told by the overall factory of J. N. Ward & Co. that they would enlarge their works, but they are unable to get lady operatives. The solid and steady progress the city has made is shown in the fact that the demand for a class of labor of which there was an abundance five years ago, now far exceeds the supply.

According to this it is a good thing when girls can go into factories. To go a little further, the millennium will have arrived when we find work for the babes in the cradle.

But it is hard to convince the able bodied man, who must loaf on the street corner while the girl does his work for smaller pay, that this is right. Much rather would he do the work and keep the girl at school and home in her natural sphere than to see her wearing out her young life while he is compelled to remain idle.

A. R. G.

A Protectionist Nailed.

SOMERVILLE, Mass.—Professor Robert Ellis Thompson, in his book entitled "Protection to Home Industry," makes the remarkable confession that: "We believe that He who has thus fixed the bounds of the nations has given to each of them such natural resources as would enable its people to become independent of all others for the great staples of necessary use."

Now, either we have not such natural resources and we need a tariff, or we have such resources and we do not need a tariff. Who shall say that we have not such resources? Then why not bring up our infant industries on the strength of those resources, their natural food? They would be as healthy as the ice industry, which is not protected from Canadian or any other ice. Such infants would not then have to be wheeled around in baby carriages with the protection bottle at their mouths.

JOHN SHEPHERD.

The Growing Hope.

MANISTEE, Mich.—At last a campaign of living issues is beginning, and what it is going to do for us is already apparent. It seems strange how any one can fail to see that this tariff question is really a means by which we can indoctrinate the people with land reform ideas. Let them see once the simplicity of freedom in trade and the other almost comes of itself, viz., freedom of land. I do not think one who does not go among laboring men has any idea of the quiet enthusiasm among them on the land question. There is a feeling among them that they have reached a real solution—not, indeed, a cureall, but a great help in bringing on the day of justice. One little thing needs to be continually drummed on, and that is that it is not land, but land values, that are to be taxed. Many fail to see the real point, because they think we want to tax land.

ALBERT WALKLEY.

PEN, PASTE AND SCISSORS.

In New Orleans strong towers, 150 feet high are being constructed, and on these telegraph and telephone wires are to be carried above the streets and buildings. They are also to sustain stand-pipes with nozzles at different elevations, to which hose can be attached and used in case of fire. The cause of their construction was the fact that electric wires could not be laid underground, because the city level is largely below the water level of the Mississippi.

Paper "window glass" is now said to be an assured fact. As described: A window pane is made of white paper, manufactured from cotton or linen, and modified by chemical action. Afterward the paper is dipped in a preparation of camphor and alcohol, which makes it like parchment. From this point it can be molded and cut into remarkably tough sheets entirely transparent, and it can be dyed with almost all of the aniline colors, the result being a transparent sheet, showing far more vivid hues than the best glass exhibits.

All the garrisons within the limit of the Seventh German army corps, says the *Medical Herald*, have now been provided with larger samples of the new article of food which is in future to form the so-called "iron ration" of the men in the field. It is a peculiar kind of bread, in the shape of small cubes the size of a chocolate drop, made of fine wheat bread, strongly spiced, and calculated to keep for a long time. When taken into the mouth, it quickly softens, and is both palatable and nutritious. It is chiefly intended for forced marches, when there is no time for camping and cooking.

The feature of a recent meeting of the British royal society was an exhibition by Mr. Henry Burns of a class of nests of live ants. These were so arranged that all the elaborate internal economy of the insects could be fully observed. A cable despatch says that "in one cell was the queen, with servants attending upon her. In another were the aphides, or cows, watchfully herded by their keepers; and a party of workers were engaged in walling up an intruding queen which had been placed in the nest that morning. The state of ant civilization was so remarkably high that nobody would have been much surprised at a party of scientific ants in spectacles taking notes on the royal society."

An item of interest in connection with the proposed introduction of "World-English" is going the rounds of the press, crediting President Eliot of Harvard college with having said, "I sat down to dinner one stormy night, in a Swiss inn, with sixteen people. Six different nationalities were represented by these sixteen people, and the only language that they could all speak was English. One may travel now, as I have just traveled, through southern Spain, through northern Africa, through Greece and Constantinople, and back by Vienna, and the more usual routes, with nothing but English. I do not mean to say that you may not occasionally feel the need of some French words, but you can travel comfortably through all these countries with no language but English. That, I am sure, could not have been said twenty-five years ago. The spread of the language within that time for purposes of commerce is most noticeable, as is also the increased knowledge of the language and literature among educated people on the continent of Europe.

The *Popular Science Monthly* describes a curious and ingenious device called "The Echo Maker," to be used on ships at sea. A daring funnel is screwed to the muzzle of a rifle. When a supposed obstacle is near the vessel, the rifle is fired in its direction, and if the obstacle is there the beam of sound projected through the tunnel strikes the obstacle and rebounds, and as the echo is more or less perfect in proportion as the obstacle is more or less parallel to the ship from which the gun is fired, and as it is near or remote, the position of the obstacle may be inferred. The inventor claims that a sharp sound projected at or nearly at an object, and only when so directed, will in every case return some of the sound sent, so that, theoretically, there will always be an echo, and the difference in the time between the sound sent and the echo will indicate the remoteness of the object. The naval board tried the echo maker and found that a return sound could be heard from the side of a fort half a mile away; from passing steamers a quarter of a mile off if broadside to; from bluffs and sails of vessels at about the same distance, and from spar buoys 200 yards away.

Convict Labor in Australia in Early Days.

Sydney, Australia, Bulletin.

Free immigration began to set in in larger numbers now than ever before, and as most of those who came brought some little money with them, they are usually described as being of a better class than those who reached Botany bay up to this time. If a new arrival could prove to the governor his ability to maintain five convicts for a fixed number of years, and was prepared to enter into a bond to that effect, he received a grant of 500 acres of land, with a breeding cow to each convict. For ten convict servants he received 1,000 acres and ten cows; and so on. From this dates the real beginning of the convict assignment system, though, of course, convict servants had been assigned out more or less from the first days of the settlement. The demand for convict labor became so great that "though great multitudes were annually transported from England, numbers of free immigrants had to wait, with great inconvenience, for convict servants with whose labor to cultivate the lands."

It is needless to explain at this late hour of the day that convict service was in reality a kind of white slavery, intensified by all the most degrading and repulsive features of negro slavery, but also with some superadded horrors of his own. On their arrival the convicts were first drafted off into the convicts' depot at Hyde park. There applications were attended to, and white labor portioned off among the applicants in their due proportions. Major Goulburn was the governor's grand vizier in those days, and the center of the iniquitous system at whose heart he sat like some ill-omened spider in its web, disposing of the souls and bodies of convict men and women just as he disposed of the government cattle and sheep. The "impenetrable major," they called him in those days, and it can easily be imagined what an object of awe this all-powerful official was to the men and women whose lives lay at the mercy of his slightest sign. His was an iron rule. The colony was a prison, he said, and the prisoners were to be treated accordingly. So they were.

Nearly every large holder of assigned convict servants was a magistrate. A flogger was part of each magistrate's retinue, and the triangles were a common feature in every well regulated homestead. Neighboring employers honored each other's notes of hand by administering a flogging to the bearer; and often a worthy magistrate, in the cool shadow of his spacious verandah, dined pleasantly with his wife and daughters to the music of a yelling wretch triced up to the torture at an easy distance away.

Because Land Has Been More Completely Monopolized There than Here.

Cleveland Sun.

If free trade is really such a good thing for the laboring classes as Mr. Grover Cleveland and his southern allies would have us believe, why do not the laboring classes of the United States all flock to England and Ireland and Germany and Italy where it now is in full operation, where it runs and is glorified?

IRISH LANDLORD RAPACITY.

Instances of What the Peasantry Have Long Been Suffering—Justification of the Plan of Campaign.

A special correspondent writing to the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* presents the following facts relative to an Irish estate, the tenants on which, unable longer to bear their landlord's tyranny and exorbitant rents, arose in rebellion not long since and engaged in the plan of campaign. The correspondent says:

The property belongs to Mr. Anthony Ormsby, and is situated at Ballynamore, near Bally, county Mayo. On looking up some records of the condition of the estate when held by the uncle of the present owner, the late Anthony Ormsby, I came across some figures which, in a general way, indicate the nature of the holdings. More or less haphazard, I give the following specimens:

Townlands.	Number of Holdings.	Number of Persons.	Gov't Valuation. £ s. d.	Rents. £ s. d.
Laragan	12	77	65 19 0	108 0 0
Ballinamor	16	96	108 0 0	169 0 0
Ballia affy	9	62	127 6 0	171 0 0
Derrywolly	13	89	108 6 0	170 15 0
Comderra	8	72	47 19 9	77 5 0
Carrindyne	15	108	137 0 0	227 0 0

Almost every one of these town lands consists of mountain slopes. They were all reclaimed by the tenants without a hand's turn being done for them by the landlord. Of course in equity the monstrous injustice of such rents demanded for such holdings is manifest. The landlord's right in equity would be not one penny more than the prairie value. However, in addition to the above enormous rents, the tenants were forced to pay the entire taxes, not even getting the usual allowance of half poor rates. They were also obliged to discharge "duty work," as it was called—that is, to supply to the landlord free labor themselves and all the members of their families, with their horses and donkeys.

It will hardly be credited that the tenants were obliged to get the landlord's consent to the marriage of their children, and if they omitted to do so they were mercilessly find. Yet such is the incontrovertible fact. Thirty-five tenants were evicted off Laragan town land and seventeen off the town land of Durfy after they had reclaimed the land. One tenant on the last named town land, named Patrick Walsh, had had a holding for about twenty-three years at £3—the valuation was £4 10s., and it was raised by steady stages to £11 10s.

One of the tenants was fined 10s. by the landlord for the awful crime that one stone on the top of the gable was not whitewashed to the landlord's liking, and I have been told on authority, that this same man was fined 2s. 6d. for stopping at home from "duty work" to bury his child.

A tenant named John Ruane was compelled to change from where he lived, and build a new house on some waste land, in order to have it reclaimed. When he had the house built the landlord compelled him to throw it down, and to build it ten yards further in. When he had reclaimed the land the "master" again compelled him to leave the place and go and live on the mountain. The unfortunate man lost his life.

A mason named Pat Walsh worked at a building for thirty-five days, but could not get paid for fifteen days. When he took the extraordinary liberty of grumbling at this, he was made to throw down the wall and to build it up without payment, and so soon as he had it finished the man was turned out without compensation.

Thomas Cavanagh was compelled to throw down his house and build a new one for no reason that I can ascertain. When he had lived there a few years he was forced to change to a bog, where he had to build again. When he had reclaimed the bog, Mr. Ormsby changed him again for a third time, and wanted to change him a fourth time. When this unfortunate victim took the audacious liberty of mildly protesting he was turned out without a penny compensation. The unhappy man had to go to the work house, where he and his wife died.

Pat Delany was fined 10s. for his cattle straying on a bog road or boreen nearly a mile from the main road. He was fined 5s. for the top of his chimney not being whitewashed to the landlord's liking, and 5s. for stopping away from duty work.

John Carney was fined 5s. for repairing his own mearing without the landlord's consent. 10s. for taking a stone from an adjoining farm, which was unoccupied, and £1 for cutting a few whitethorn bushes.

A tenant having been "caught in the act" of kissing the girl he was engaged to be married to, the landlord fined him.

One of the most extraordinary instances of landlord rapacity and white slave driving propensity that ever came to my knowledge is the case of Michael Conlon, who was fined 12s. by this grand old Irish landlord for being seven days late in whitewashing his house; 10s. for some quicks which were pulled near the main road some distance from his house. Some seventeen years ago he was compelled to go mowing for the landlord, and was fined 7s. 6d. when he did not make a drain in his holding at the same time. He was fined 12s. 6d. for repairing his own window. He was forced to spend twenty days mowing hay at 10d. per day at a time that he might have earned 8s. per day. He was also fined £2 per annum for life for not working when his hand was sore, and £1 for burning scutch grass on his holding.

Pat Hyland of Ballintaffy was obliged to build a new house, which was often visited by the landlord when building. When finished he really did not like its appearance from the road. I have not been able to learn what it was exactly that troubled the landlord's æsthetic sense, and cannot learn that he even mentioned the difficulty further than that "he didn't fancy the cut of it." And accordingly he made the man knock it all down and build a new one. He, no doubt, promised £7 as compensation for windows and doors, but that £7 was never paid. When the house was rebuilt he made him throw down part of it and raise it some inches.

Now a perfect gem of its kind is the following: A little girl named Shearon was fined 5s. for looking through a fence on the roadside on her mother's land at a traveling show.

Twenty-six tenants (whose names I have obtained) were evicted simply that the landlord's demesne might be enlarged. Anne Nolan, a servant, was fined 5s. for going to see her mother in her illness, and, wonder of wonders! she was fined 7s. 6d. because she could not make the cows produce as much milk as they did in summer. Ormsby himself measured the milk night and day for three years. John Jennings of Laragan was fined £3 for getting married without the landlord's sanction. This was proved in open court at the Swinford quarter sessions, and all this was done in a Christian land.

It has happened that little bare footed children going to school on the road through the Ormsby property, and who walked on the grass borders of the road along his demesne, did so with the penalty that their parents were fined 2s. 6d. each by their landlord. Eight cases of this inhumanity have been mentioned to me. A road was being made through a bog; the men working on it were doing so at their own expense. The weather was very severe, and Ormsby found that the men had ceased to work for a while, whereupon he fined them 10s., and would not let them go to work on the road for months afterward.

A Famous London Cemetery.

London Echo.

Bunhill fields is a kind of Campo Santo of English nonconformity. Smoke and fog and time have obliterated countless inscriptions. The stones will stand, and it is possible to trace the skulls and the cross bones, the scythes and the hour glasses, that were the symbols of human mortality. But, saving in these comparatively few instances, where the care of descendants has kept the inscription of the chisel clear and sharp, much of great interest in the way of epitaphs has been hopelessly lost. The cemetery has been closed since 1851, like all the city burial yards.

But among the nonconformist registers in Somerset house are twenty-seven great volumes marked "Bunhillfields," and these contain the bare names and position of the graves of no less than 124,000 persons there buried, between the year 1787 and the date of closure. The grounds themselves cover an area of four and a half acres, and the caretaker tells me that some one has counted no less a number of gravestones yet standing than six thousand. One tomb stands at what was said to be the original level of the ground, and this is in a kind of sunk tank, at least four feet deep, and gives some idea of the amount of human dust which must lie within the rails. According to Defoe, it will be remembered that one of the very largest of the gruesome plague pits was dug in the north corner, into which bodies were flung by the cartload.

Many of those names which "have bought their eternity in one little hour," are among those that are sleeping their long sleep there. The erratic genius of William Blake lies somewhere there at rest, but the exact spot is now lost. This year, on the 31st of August, we shall see the bi-centenary of the great John Bunyan's death, and he was conveyed from the house of Mr. Strudwicke, on Snow hill, where he died, to this burial ground. The tomb, however, is a modern one, erected by his latter day admirers, as is that of Defoe, there also. There is a vault in which numerous members of Richard Cromwell's family are buried, and Henry Cromwell, a grandson of the protector, was only discovered to be buried there in 1869, as his monument had been buried seven feet below the surface. It was then restored by the corporation.

Another very interesting monument is that to Thomas Hardy, one of the three who in 1792 commenced the formation of the "London Corresponding Society," for the promotion of a radical reform in the house of commons. He was the last man who was tried in England, I believe, upon the charge of high treason, and his nine days' trial resulted in a triumphant victory for him. The Rev. Joseph Hughes, founder of the British and foreign bible society, sleeps there, as does also David Nasmith, the founder of city missions. But it would be impossible here to mention the numbers of men whose names are remembered for their conscientious adherence to duty, in spite of persecutions, or for their contributions to the weighty piles of theological controversy and commentary. Susannah Wesley and Dr. Watts must, however, be quoted as being interred here.

Then Where Is the Necessity of a Forty-Seven Per Cent Tariff?

Philadelphia News (Protectionist).

The advocates of the Mills bill, desperate in the prospect of defeat, have declared that the duties collected upon imported goods are just so much added in taxes upon the laboring class. That is a lie. But it has a semblance of plausibility about it, and might deceive some. A few examples, put in the following table of English and American prices, show that many manufactured articles of general consumption actually sell for less here than in England:

	England. Per Yard. Cents.	United States. Per Yard. Cents.
Prints	— to 6	5 to 6
Brown sheetings	4 1-2 to 8	4 to 8
Bleached sheetings	4 to 12	4 to 12
Drills	7 to 8	7 to 8
Tickings	7 to 20	6 to 18
Denims	7 to 10	6 to 10
Cotton dress goods	8 to 10	8 to 10
Delaines	12 to 15	10 to 15

These figures are absolutely correct. They prove the complete falsity of the statements of the free traders regarding the "taxing" of protective duties on great staples. And they might be indefinitely, almost, multiplied, until all sorts of manufactures of daily use were added to a list where the American goods sold at as low prices as the English.

Facts are not what Mills and his followers want, but they will get them, as the vernacular has it, "in the neck." If the men who are advocating the Mills bill would tell the truth about it, it would be doomed to-day; as they will not, others will.

Any one can buy a better pair of blankets in an American retail store for $2 than he can in England for the same price. Our large retailers are selling better black silks at $1.50 and $1.75 than can be bought at that price in France or England.

When it comes down to facts there are enough accessible to stop the mouths of an army of free traders.

America for the Americans.

San Francisco Examiner.

An Englishman, who is an alien, a regular Johnny Bull, walked into the office of a democratic newspaper in a thriving town in the central southern portion of the state a few days since and accosting one of the editors, said to him:

"Mr. Jones, I highly disapprove of your editorial in to-day's paper. It is calculated to injure the cause of American labor, as you approve of the president's policy in favor of removing the tariff from wool. I think you ought by all means to uphold the dignity and maintain the high wages of American labor."

Jones—Johnny Bull, you have some land here in this country, I believe. How many acres have you?

Johnny Bull—I 'ave honly about ten thousand hacres.

Jones—How did you get it?

Johnny Bull—I bought it.

Jones—How much did you pay an acre for it?

Johnny Bull—One dollar and twenty-five cents.

Jones—What is it worth per acre?

Johnny Bull—Oh, I don't know. It is not for sale.

Jones—Do you range your sheep on it?

Johnny Bull—Yes, sometimes, but I range them mostly away up in the Sierras. I send them up over a range several miles wide and nearly a hundred miles long.

Jones—Do you own that range?

Johnny Bull—No. It is government land, and I hold it under possessory claim.

Jones—Do you rent it?

Johnny Bull—No.

Jones—Do you pay taxes on it?

Johnny Bull—No.

Jones—How many sheep have you?

Johnny Bull—Only about five thousand.

Jones—How many men do you employ in taking care of these sheep?

Johnny Bull—One—a Chinaman; but he has two shepherd dogs to help him.

The Question Is Simply How Fat the Calfskin Wallet Shall Be.

City of Iron Mountain, Mich., Industrial Journal.

Here is the truth in a nutshell. Mr. Blanchard, a lumber dealer in Chicago, in an interview the other day told in a blunt, honest way, the reason why he and other lumbermen wanted a high tariff. Mr. Blanchard said:

"I am high tariff on lumber, but low tariff on wool, iron, glass, cotton, leather, etc. I will tell you why. I own timber lands and stumpage; besides, I operate largely myself, and this tariff puts money into my pocket. I get $2 per 1,000 more for my stumpage and $2 per 1,000 more for my boards. I have just sold 5,000,000 feet of lumber. Now $2 a thousand on 5,000,000 is just $10,000. That is the difference to me between high tariff and free lumber. I am high tariff on lumber, I am. This blessed tariff, they tell us, is for the benefit of the American laborer. What do you suppose I did with the $10,000? Divided it among my workmen? Not a bit of it. I put it into my calfskin wallet. Of all my workmen I am the only protected American laborer. Wages depend on supply and demand, my friends, and not on taxes. When you see two men after one boss, wages are low; but when you see two bosses after one man, wages are high; and that is the whole of it—the theory, principle and practice."

The Workingmen's Own Carnegie.

Philadelphia Evening Telegraph (Rep).

Whatever the offenses of the democrats may be, the present reduction of wages by the highly, excessively protected iron and steel masters is not one of them. The millionaire high tariff steel and iron rail maker, who is now tooling Mr. Blaine over the pleasant roads of England in a four in hand and in the most royal style, and who stated to Representative Scott of Erie that his profits in a single year from his works amounted to $1,500,000, is chiefly responsible for the reduction in wages in the iron trade. He determined not long ago to reduce the wages of his employes one-sixth, and he did it. He took nothing from the sum actually paid, but for that same wage he increased the hours of labor one-sixth. His employes refused to accept the reduction, he closed his works against them and employed in their stead on his own terms alien workmen who were living in overcrowded idleness in the region of his plant. This highly protected manufacturer took imported free labor to use as a club to beat out the brains of his old employes, who, seeing that they were beaten by it, surrendered, and, accepting his hard conditions, went back to their places, while he went off to Europe to play the royal host with his four-in-hand to Mr. Blaine. The example set by Mr. Carnegie is simply being followed by others. The industrial districts of the eastern states are so overrun with imported free labor as to render it easy to compel the acceptance of reduced wages. It was but the other day that we called attention to the fact that a contractor in this sort of labor offered to supply at once two or three hundred Italian laborers at sixty cents a day. That tells the whole sad story of wage reduction; the supply of a certain sort is greater than the demand, and its cheapness affects the entire market.

Not a Question of Ability to Pay

Wichita (Kan.) Beacon.

To acknowledge that high tariffs are maintained for the sole benefit of the manufacturer would be fatal to their existence at once. Their advocates are too smart for that. They not only do not admit that such is the fact, but in the argument for protection they keep out of sight as much as possible their own interest in the tariff taxes. They say it is all for labor.

When reminded that the increased price of goods is not paid to the workmen, but to the manufacturer, they answer: "Very true, but it enables us to pay our workmen higher wages than are paid to European laborers." To this we make reply: And this is very true also; it does enable you to pay higher wages, but you don't do it.

CURRENT THOUGHT.

Men, Women and Money.

In the *Forum* for June Mrs. Julia Ward Howe discusses the question of "Men, Women and Money," drawing attention to the fact that, notwithstanding her demonstrated capacity for wealth production, the woman of to-day too often finds the position of wife and mother a footstool rather than a throne—that she is looked upon not as an equal of the husband in the family copartnership, entitled to a voice in its administration, but as a mere executive officer, whose business is to conduct the affairs of the home and especially to regulate its expenses in strict and almost unquestioning accord with the decrees of the male "head of the family."

To secure a fair adjustment of financial arrangements between husband and wife, the man and woman contemplating matrimony must enter into it as equal sharers in the responsibilities of their new condition, and in the means by which these responsibilities should be met. They must have rational views of the uses of money, and of the objects which it should be made to forward and attain. They must also have worthy views of life and of its true ends, in the compassing of which money plays an important though a secondary part. They should be careful to come to an understanding of each other's views on these subjects before marriage, and should seek afterward and always to better this understanding by free and fearless conference and discussion. Lastly, their household should be held and made to represent family life in its substantial dignity and happiness, as the foundation of the state and the concomitant of the church universal. Where these conditions are complied with, the money question between husband and wife will never be a vexed one. Each will vie with the other in a generous economy and in the sacrifice of merely personal whims and predilections to the common good. While exacting from each other no unjustifiable act of confidence, each will trust the other, because both equally revere the high ideals of justice and honor. In following these their labor will be great, but let us say, its recompense will be more than commensurate.

True words—noble words—but alas! all but utterly useless. Of all the couples who were married yesterday in these United States, how many are there whose households can by any possibility be "held and made to represent family life in its substantial dignity and happiness?" How many are there who can hope ever to have any thing worthy of the name of home? The overwhelming majority of them must look forward to lives spent, not in considering the rational uses of money and "the objects which it should be made to forward and attain," but in striving to solve the ever pressing problem, how to get a living. Men and women so circumstanced cannot either erect or maintain lofty ideals. And if they could, their lives would be insupportable.

And this is not because of privation, but because of poverty. The matron of New England's early days had plenty of privations to endure, but she certainly occupied a position more nearly approaching Mrs. Howe's ideal than that held by most modern wives. But in those days the adminstration of the home really was the most important business of the conjugal copartnership, whereas to-day it occupies, of necessity, a secondary place. Then the business of life was to *live*, and not, to hoard or scheme for riches. The earth gave her increase year by year, and the grateful husbandman consumed it, thanking God, and oppressed by no fear of a coming day when there should be for him no earth and no increase either. But now the worker, as he takes his wage each week or month, knows that at any moment he may be deprived of the privilege of work—refused permission to apply his labor to nature's raw material; and that if that time comes and finds him unprepared, it will be worse for him and worse for those dependent on him. For one so situated, home and its administration are matters of minor importance. The problem of life for him is not how he can best bring up his children, not how he can uphold the dignity of family life, not even how he can make his labor most efficient for the production of wealth; but by hoarding of his earnings, by cutting off every expense that can be avoided, by every trick and device that commercial morality approves, to acquire a measure of direct or indirect control over natural opportunities and so levy a tax upon the labor of other men.

A Forced Loan.

Edward Atkinson contributes to the June issue of the *Popular Science Monthly* a peculiarly atkinsonian essay—he calls it a memorandum—on "The Surplus Revenue," in which he takes the bold but curious ground that there really isn't any such thing as a surplus revenue. There is a greater revenue than is needed "for conducting the functions of the government and meeting the current expenses of the nation, the pensions and other like obligations already incurred." But when we talk about surplus revenue, Mr. Atkinson hauls a greenback from his pocket and triumphantly asks us what we mean to do about *that*.

Would a private corporation consider itself in possession of a surplus revenue from its business, which it would be at liberty to deal with at its own pleasure, *if* it owed a large sum of money on demand and a still larger sum of money subject to be paid on demand within a short period of time? No sound business man could be found who would affirm that under such conditions a private corporation could make any more suitable use of the revenue received in excess of its necessary expenditure than to apply it to the payment of its debt due on demand, and to prepare the way for making payment of the debt soon to become due at a date fixed.

If this reasoning be applied to the present condition of the United States, it will appear that the government is not at the present time in the possession of a surplus revenue in any true sense. It owes on demand that sum of money which is represented by the evidences of debt, known as legal tender notes, and commonly called greenbacks.

In order to be able to pay these notes on demand when demand is made, the treasury of the United States holds a special reserve of $100,000,000 in gold coin; but the amount of notes due is in round figures $350,000,000. The United States, therefore, owes substantially $250,000,000 on demand, for which it has as yet made no specific provision either in gold coin, or to any considerable extent even in silver coin which can be made available for such payments. The remainder of its gold held in the treasury above the special reserve of $100,000,000 is either subject to payment on demand in liquidation of gold certificates of deposits, or else it constitutes a part of the necessary daily balance of money necessary to the ordinary conduct of business. The larger part, if not the whole, of the silver dollars held by the treasury are held to meet the payment of the silver certificates which have been issued against them. There are, therefore, substantially $250,000,000 of United States notes due on demand, for which no specific provision has yet been made and to the payment of which the so-called surplus revenue could not be applied. Yet the public mind has become so accustomed to the common use of a debt currency, which under a fiction of law has been declared to be lawful money by the supreme court of the United States, as to have lost sight of the fact that the greenback or legal tender note is not true money, but that it is an evidence of debt to be paid. Therefore, no consideration is given to the possible application of surplus revenue, so called, to such payment of these notes now due on demand.

This comparison of the United States government to a private corporation is ingenious, though not strictly original; but Mr. Atkinson, we regret to say, has not "caught on" to its full significance. This is extraordinary, because the Boston statistician and diagraphist has heretofore shown himself remarkably courageous in following his ideas to their legitimate conclusions—as when, in his famous essay on roast pig and rations he demonstrated, by the *a priori* method, that an American citizen could be comfortably shod with one boot a year.

Would a private corporation ever acknowledge that it had any surplus revenue *if* it possessed an unlimited power of levying taxes on sixty odd millions of people? We try to put this question in atkinsonian form, italics and all; and respectfully announce that if Mr. Atkinson will forward his reply to it to THE STANDARD office, we will answer his query about the corporation and the surplus—"*if*" he wants us to.

But this isn't all of Edward Atkinson. He isn't content with asking questions. He adduces argument. And he founds his argument on facts. They and the italics that emphasize them are both Mr. Atkinson's:

These notes were issued in time of war for the purpose of collecting a forced loan, and for no other purpose. The necessity for a forced loan has ceased; the revenue of the government is in excess of its necessary expenditures. When the revenue derived from taxation is paid to the government in its own notes, that forced loan, to the amount of such notes paid in, has been liquidated by way of taxation. Each note returned to the treasury in settlement of a tax becomes like a common bank note when redeemed by the bank; it is a note paid. It is *functus officio*. Its reissue by the treasury of the United States is, in fact, the collection of *a new forced loan* without authority of law under any act authorizing such a new loan, without necessity, without benefit to any one, and with positive danger to the whole community.

"Land o' massy," said grandma, "how things do change! Now when I was a girl, we just made a hole in both ends of the egg and sucked!" Mr. Atkinson *must* have been the original of the little boy in that venerable story. Just think of it. We take a money order down to the post office, expecting to get wherewithal to buy bread and beef and innocent amusement, and the brute of a cashier collects a forced loan from us. And he does it so deftly that we never know the difference, but put the forced loan in our pocket, and sinfully pass it away to the butcher and the baker, who put it in *their* pockets, and never realize what a gigantic swindle the government is perpetrating on them by not seizing the bread and beef in their shops to sell for gold with which to redeem that wicked, wicked, forced loan. Suppose *all* the butchers and bakers, and the candlestick makers to boot, should find it out! Why, there would be a revolution. Edward Atkinson ought to be careful.

So much for the fact; now for the argument:

When the fact is baldly stated, which can not be denied, that the reissue of these notes from the treasury of the United States is not the continuance of a former loan, but is the actual borrowing of new money under a forced loan and in time of peace, can anything be more absurd than to assume that such a course is necessary?

Well, yes; we think something can be more absurd. We don't want to hurt Mr. Atkinson's feelings, so we won't say what. But if he only *would* stick to his cooking stoves, what a lot of good he might do.

England and the Coming War.

The leading article in the first number of the *Universal Review* is from the pen of Sir Charles Dilke, and discusses "the state of Europe and the position of England." In European politics Sir Charles has long held preeminent position as an expert; he is familiar with the administration of the British foreign and war departments, and has had opportunity to learn much regarding continental military matters. His views on the subjects he discusses are therefore of special interest at the present time, when civilization is quivering with anticipation of the outbreak of a contest greater than the world has yet seen.

On the whole, Sir Charles is of opinion that there is no immediate danger of a general outbreak—which is much the same as saying there is no danger of any outbreak at all. It is true, he wrote while Emperor Frederick was still alive; but he claims that "the main lines of German foreign policy are so completely regulated by the geographical, political and military situation of Germany, that the occupancy of the German throne is a matter of comparatively secondary European importance." And he clearly thinks that neither in Germany nor France is the situation such as is likely to make for war. Both nations have provided for immense additions to their armies; but each is well aware that, whatever may be its rival's situation, it itself is in no condition to materialize anything like the whole of its paper legions into actual effective battalions.

The present nominal French force of all kinds is between 3,500,000 and 4,000,000 of men, but it is thought that France could only place in line on the tenth day of mobilization 700,000, or on the seventeenth day 1,000,000, with 800,000 in garrisons and depots. Behind these 1,800,000 men there would remain a great number—in short, about as many more—for whom there would be no regular place and no proper officers; and it is doubtful whether much could be made of them. So it is with Germany, so it is with Russia, with Italy, and with all the powers; and I repeat, that we shall soon come to counting officers only as between power and power, rather than totaling up the masses of men.

When the tremendous tension now existing is broken, and the inevitable struggle does begin, Sir Charles Dilke thinks the struggle will be, not between France and Germany, but between France and Russia on the one side, and England on the other:

While I do not believe, for reasons which I gave last year, that Boulangism in France is dangerous to Germany, I fear that it adds to the risk of a Franco-Russian coalition against ourselves. Like many other foreigners of English blood, General Boulanger does not love England, and representing as he does the military spirit, while he is unwilling to incur the frightful penalties of a war with Germany, he will not be unlikely, should he get the chance, to wield the military power of France in support of Russian policy elsewhere than on the continent of Europe—that is, against ourselves. *La Cocarde*, the general's organ, has already proclaimed the anti-English policy. A question may illustrate the truth of my contention as to the reality of our dangers. Are French and Russian fast cruisers being built in enormous numbers for any possible purpose except the avowed purpose of attacking our trade in the event of a war which both those powers certainly look upon as possible? If they prepare offensive weapons, must not we prepare defense?

What defense is England prepared to offer to this combined attack? As to ships, she has indeed an enormous list of names, and an imposing total of guns; but the number of vessels possessing the all important requirement of speed is very limited:

All the powers have been multiplying cruisers to attack our commerce—France and Russia especially so, of course. . . . An enormous clearance in our navy list would indeed at once be made in case of war on this account. The slow ships would be put into port or would be sunk by the enemy within the first few weeks; but when we go through our tables of speed and compare them with the speed of foreign cruisers we find that the clearance would be greater than we are generally disposed to anticipate. Now, it must be remembered that we are the defending power, and France and Russia the attacking powers. It is not for the defense of Russian trade, it is not for the defense of French trade, that 22-knot ships are being built abroad; it is for attack upon that trade on which we depend for life, for cutting off that food without which the majority of our people cannot live. Our trade is as great as that of Europe, our shipping double that of Europe, and Admiral Aube, M. Weyl and M. Gabriel Charmes have shown the extent to which that commerce is exposed to French attack. France during the last three years has been rapidly carrying out this policy, and Lord Brassey gives a list of 14 cruisers, mostly of the first class, all of them having a speed of 19 or 20 knots, which are being built in France; while the Russians have just completed some, and are building other vessels of the same class, for the avowed purpose of preying upon our trade. The tables given in Lord Brassey's book of unarmored and protected cruisers, built and building, are far from pleasant reading. In the "20 knots and over" class Lord Brassey places 5 French or Russian cruisers to our 2; in the "19 to 20 knots and over" classes, 18 French or Russian to our 5; in the "18 knots and over" classes, 27 French or Russian to our 16; in the "17 knots and over" classes, 31 French or Russian to our 27; in the "15 knots and over," 44 French or Russian to our 41; in the "14 knots and over," 61 French or Russian to our 47; while at 13 knots we have a majority. This table would be improved by including in it the belted cruisers and ships of the Imperieuse type; but even then, at a speed of over 19 knots, France and Russia would have, according to Lord Brassey, 56,000 tons of cruisers to England's 14,500, and in future wars it is the "19 knots and over" classes that will count for distant service. No doubt we have the merchant steamers; but so great is the French superiority in the fastest cruisers, that it is doubtful whether in the fastest classes we have enough merchant steamers to counterbalance that French superiority. Ships of the class of which I speak can be built more rapidly, of course, than ironclads, but they cannot be turned out with sufficient rapidity for us to be able to count upon what we could do after a declaration of war. Speed is now the first factor in naval warfare, and "England was the last naval power to recognize" the new conditions.

As for the land fighting, that our writer thinks would be chiefly done in India, and then the chief defense would be the difficulty Russia would find in moving and subsisting her troops across the desolate regions of Afghanistan. But Russian troops in Afghanistan would have to be met by British troops upon the same ground; and Sir Charles Dilke is by no means blind to the fact that a British defeat beyond the frontier would probably be the signal for an uprising of the native Indian princes. He suggests as a precaution against this contingency, the adoption of the Roman plan of using troops of one subject race to keep down another—garrisoning India with regiments of Chinese, Malays and negroes, and withdrawing the fighting men of India, in their turn, to other parts of the empire.

The conclusion to be drawn from our inquiries, then, appears to be, that, while we could at present hold our own in a single handed war with Russia, there is the greatest need for a careful reconsideration of our naval and military position if we are to feel safe against a combination—not improbable in the event of General Boulanger's rise to power—of France and Russia. Even as against Russia only, we cannot afford long to rest upon our oars.

Sir Charles says never a word about the possibility of an invasion of England; but his forecast of other probabilities will do little to allay the semi-panic with which Great Britain is now affected.

Dr. Hale's "Wealth in Common."

The Reverend Edward Everett Hale is a certificated doctor, or teacher, of divinity, who writes for the *Press* of this city ingenious allegories illustrative of the folly of doing unto Irishmen, Germans, and other foreigners as we would they should do unto us, and also occupies the editorial chair of a Boston "magazine of organized philanthropy" entitled *Lend a Hand*.

To the June issue of this last named periodical the reverend doctor contributes four pages of philanthropy, under the title, "Wealth in Common," which he had previously utilized as an address at the opening meeting of the Boston society for citizenship. Just why Dr. Hale should have delivered this address or republished it in his magazine is not very clear, since he neither defends nor attacks any principle, but projects his language into space, as an idle boy throws a stone, regardless of where or whom it may strike. But he makes in it some statements that are sufficiently curious, as illustrating the mental processes of a man who tries to be at one and the same time a preacher of Christ, a teacher of divinity, a defender of the protective system, and the manager of a magazine of organized philanthropy.

Dr. Hale tells us that a great many theorists—he says "the theorists of all time," but of course that is absurd, since he himself is an exception—don't believe that men should own any personal property of any kind, and "look with a certain regret on the original system, by which there was virtually no personal property, either in land or in anything." The doctor doesn't say that these theorists are wrong; but he thinks they would be less discontented if they would only bethink themselves what an extraordinary amount of wealth really is held in common at the present day. And then the good doctor goes on to give us an inventory, as follows:

For the statement of facts, I shall take the present valuation of the city of Boston, because we are in Boston, and because I happen to be most familiar with this city. The valuation of the city, as reported by the auditor in 1886, was $710,621,335, held by separate persons and corporations. To this is to be added—of property held by the city: the common and public squares, the new park, and a large amount of land to which no value is assigned.

Now, at the same time, the same assessors valued the real and personal property of the city of Boston as a corporation at $68,827,245. There is to be added also the cost, whatever it may be, of the streets and roads of the city, which have been, sooner or later, obtained at the public charge, or reserved from the common property when the separate property was granted to individuals.

In addition to this property held by the city government, we have all the property of the United States within the limits of the city, embracing the navy yard, with acres on the deepest water front of the city, and the two islands, with their fortifications, which represent an expenditure only to be counted in tens of millions. The United States also owns the custom house and the post office. The land occupied by these buildings, and the cost of the buildings themselves, would be, I suppose, eight or ten millions of dollars.

The property of the commonwealth in the city is the state house, with the land adjacent, and a very considerable property still on the Back bay, together with the rights, similar to those which have been used in the Back bay, to all the land beneath the sea, below the line of low water mark. The state also reserves the right of eminent domain to the whole property.

Roughly stated these sums will foot up thus:

City property (assessors' return)	$68,827,245
Common and squares, 125 acres, say	25,000,000
Cost of streets (50 years)	35,681,547
Pavements (15 years), say	15,000,000
Sewers (15 years), say	2,600,000
New park	4,975,000
Improved trunk sewer, etc., say	4,000,000
Bridges (15 years), say	2,000,000
	$158,083,792

To this very considerable additions must be made—not so easily estimated. There is the property in real estate and funds of all public associations which hold property for the common good. Such institutions as the Massachusetts hospital, the eye and ear infirmary, the dispensary and similar institutions, are a part of the wealth in common which the citizen shares, by himself or by any one who is in need of their relief. So of the property in churches. They are open to all persons who will enter. Any church not open to any person who wished to enter would be taxed by the commonwealth as a private club house, which, indeed, it would be. So far forth, then, the real estate of 200 and more churches is to be considered as adding to the amount of the wealth in common.

To these sums must be added, a navy yard of eighty-three acres, owned by the United States, on a perfect water front, and all the national property in the forts in the harbor, with the custom house and court house.

There must also be added the property of the commonwealth. Beside the state house, the city, state and United States hold 30,000,000 square feet of land within the limits of Boston, not named above, on which no valuation is placed.

All these amounts together show that our wealth in common is certainly much more than one-half the total wealth of all the separate properties.

But, in truth, our wealth in common goes much further. For in common we hold all the margin of property which does not appear on assessors' lists, and yet which has a value for us. Suppose a railway, which does not pay more than its expenses. Its stock is worth perhaps nothing, and does not appear on any valuation. Still, if it carry me to and fro every day, it is a part of my wealth in common.

The estimate above includes of the property of the nation only its real estate within the town of Boston. But the people of Boston have an undivided share in the wealth in common held by the United States in its public lands, its army and navy and post office departments, its libraries and laboratories. The citizens of Massachusetts have a similar share in all the wealth in common held by that state.

More than this, for the administration of our wealth in common we exact every year probably sixteen thousandths, more than one and a half per cent of that private "property" against which our wealth in common has been compared. What is the proper worth of property, aside from the industry of the owner, cannot be precisely said. Government stocks, where there is good credit, pay a little less than three per cent. The real interest on money, where there is no inteiligence used in its direction, may perhaps now be called four per cent. The community takes one and a half per cent of this in the shape of taxes. It appears that the community takes fifteen-fortieths, or three-eighths of the income of private property—toward the wealth in common. With this it administers justice, maintains the peace, educates the children, preserves the health and serves the general welfare of the people.

Were the wealth in common then only one-half what the total separate wealth is, the rough showing would be this:

In common each man holds, say, one-half of A.

He has the control of one-third of A.

In private the average man has the control of two-thirds of A, provided he has not mortgaged A, or otherwise encumbered it.

There is a story told of a certain sage, now deceased, who, when the supply of coal for his family ran short, used to tell his wife that warmth and coldness were purely subjective conditions; that all she needed was to think herself warm and she would *be* warm. And therewith the sage would go off to discourse philosophy by the fireside of a brother sage, and leave the wife of his bosom to enjoy subjective warmth to her heart's content. Dr. Hale's wealth is pretty much like that sage's heating apparatus. All you need do is to think you have it, and you've got it. And if you discontentedly want more, a trifling expansion of thought will fill Fortunatus's purse for you twice over. Say, for instance, a tramp in Boston streets thinks his dividend of $158,083,793 scarcely large enough, he can double the value of the common, and squares, and parks, and streets, and so add $75,000,000 to the public property of which he is part owner. If that isn't enough, he can treble it, or take in some more land beneath the sea, or agitate for the building of a few more churches, or an increase of taxation. If he wants to ride, he is a part owner in every railway that doesn't pay expenses, and need only beg the money to pay his fare to have the full enjoyment of his property. Whichever way things go, he is better off. If property booms, and rents increase, the value of the common streets increases; if business is dull, and nobody makes any money, he becomes a part owner in every business that is conducted without profit. The only trouble is, that all this subjective wealth will put precious little food into his objective belly.

When Dr. Hale dies, if he goes, as we trust he will, to that glorious city of "many mansions," he will be sadly disappointed if, in reply to his application for a share of the good things, he is presented with the key of the street and a tract descriptive of the "wealth in common" of the New Jerusalem. He will learn then what he seems unable to understand now, that land, whether in a common, or in streets, or under water, or on the open prairie, never is, never was, and never can be, wealth. He will understand that wealth can only be produced by the application of labor to land. And as he wanders homeless over the jasper pavements he will perhaps mutter to himself that to tell a disinherited child of God of the vast amount of common wealth in parks and streets, and Back bays, while refusing him the privilege of using a rood of earth without first paying blackmail to some owner, is very much like giving a little boy five cents for his very own, only he must put it in the missionary box.

Books Received.

Principles of the Economic Philosophy of Society, Government and Industry. By Van Buren Denslow, LL.D. Cassell & Co., New York.

The Protective Tariff. What it Does for Us. Hermann List. Belford, Clarke & Co., New York, Chicago and San Francisco.

Taxation in American States and Cities. Prof. Richard T. Ely. T. Y. Cronell & Co., New York.

The National Revenues: A Collection of papers by American Economists. Edited by Albert Shaw. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

The Russian Peasantry; their Agrarian Condition, Social Life and Religion. By Stepniak. Harper & Bros., New York.

An Outline of the French Revolution; Its Causes and Results. By W. S. Bell. The Truth Seeker company, New York.

THE FIRST ESSENTIAL REFORM.

Comment on such demogogue rot as Hill's objections is needless. His real reason for the veto was that the bill would secure honest and fair elections, and would deprive his friends, the disreputable ward bosses, of much of their power for mischief.—[Boston Herald.

Governor Hill's action on it was merely a bid for the renomination at the hands of the worst elements of the New York democracy, and the goods will probably be delivered; but honest voters should bear it in mind and administer a salutary rebuke to him at the polls. —[Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph.

New York has a "dandy" for a governor. He has vetoed the Saxton bill, intended "to secure more fully the independence of the electors and the secrecy of the ballot," and the Fassett anti-bribery bill. These vetoes are for the benefit of ballot box swindlers and vote buyers. It is tolerably evident that the Hon. David B. Hill is one of "the boys."—[Minneapolis Evening Journal.

There are a good many people in the state of New York who would like to see an honest election made possible, and it is an open question whether Governor Hill's action regarding this bill—which, though it may have had its minor defects, was a long step in the right direction—will assist or prejudice his re-election. Evidently he thinks it will assist him, as the reasons given by him for withholding his signature are not worthy of a moment's consideration.—[The Elizabethport, Elizabethport, N. J.

At present the success of an independent candidate is almost an impossibility, because of the enormous expense of printing and distributing ballots, on which is saddled an enormously greater illegal expense. Yet Governor Hill gravely gives us as a reason for vetoing this bill for preventing bribery, that it "hinders and impedes an elector from voting for whom he pleases." His real reason is that "it hinders and impedes the halls and heelers in debauching elections, bribing voters and stealing all they please from the treasury.—[Philadelphia Justice.

This bill, carefully matured and designed to work one of the greatest reforms possible, was supported by all republicans, by independent and honorable democrats, and by the leaders of the several labor organizations. It was vetoed by Governor Hill for reasons altogether frivolous and absurd. It will not be amiss to make ballot reform an issue in every coming state election. The new system should be adopted for this state by the coming legislature.—[St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Why Some of the Politicians Are Puzzled.

Milwaukee Review.

It seems somewhat difficult for politicians to understand the political attitude of Henry George. But there is no mistaking him in the role of a philosopher, who has a theory which he believes to be the only practical solution of the prevalence of poverty in the midst of an increasing wealth, that is figured out to support the idea of our increasing national prosperity. Mr. George possesses the rare independence of thought and action that enables him to speak for any movement which, in his opinion, will promote the spread of this theory. . . . He will be better understood by and by when his theory is better understood. His position in politics will also be apparent as the campaign goes on. If the leaders of our parties could be as safely depended upon to steadfastly represent a principle as Henry George sticks to his land tax text, first, last and always, there would be some chance that political honesty would prevail.

All Talking About It.

Omaha World.

Omaha boy (writing a composition)—Pop, how do you spell tariff?

Pop—Look in the dictionary and then you'll remember.

"It's on the top shelf."

"Well, look in the newspaper."

"What newspaper?"

"Any newspaper."

SINGLE TAX CLUB MEETINGS.

HARLEM SINGLE TAX CLUB.—The Harlem Single Tax Club has a permanent organization, and holds weekly meetings at 247 West 125th street, on Tuesday evening, at 8:30 p. m.

TO THE SINGLE TAX MEN OF WEST VIRGINIA: Will the single tax men in West Virginia please send their addresses to me at this point. Send the names of all the George men you know of in your neighborhood and be particular to give post office address. A state organization is proposed and any suggestions or information will be carefully considered. W. I. BOREMAN, Parkersburg, Wood county, West Virginia.

KANSAS STATE LECTURER.—THE undersigned state lecturer and member of the state central committee is now ready to respond to calls for work anywhere in the state of Kansas. Address Rev. W. M. GOODNER, box 75, Larn d, Kan.

REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE CLEVELAND land and labor club are held on Monday evenings at 8 o'clock, room 6, No. 56 Public square. Everyone is cordially invited to attend our meetings.

PRINTING.

Vol. 4